

Copyright  
by  
Susan Elizabeth Carbon  
2003

**The Dissertation Committee for Susan Elizabeth Carbon  
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following  
dissertation:**

**Conversational Narrative: A Meta-Analysis of  
Narrative Analysis**

**Committee:**

---

Carl Blyth, Supervisor

---

Betsy Kerr

---

Knud Lambrecht

---

Jean-Pierre Montreuil

---

Joel Sherzer

**Conversational Narrative: A Meta-Analysis of  
Narrative Analysis**

**by**

**Susan Elizabeth Carbon, BA, MA**

**Dissertation**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**December 2003**

## **Dedication**

For John, my mom and my four babies who all in their own ways  
helped me write this dissertation.

## **Acknowledgements**

This dissertation has required great effort and determination to complete and there are many people who have helped me that I would like to acknowledge here. First and foremost, I could not have completed this dissertation without the patient support and encouragement of my husband, John. Thank you for enduring these four long years so that I could achieve my goal. My mom gave me many pep talks along the way and helped me to never give up. During this process and always she has made me believe that I can be anything I want to be and for that I am ever thankful. This process would have been much lonelier without the company of Franc and Guilder who sat with me while I worked at the computer. You will never realize the encouragement that you both provided. I would also like to thank Melissa, Stephanie and Bea for housing me and providing me with incredible moral support during my many trips back to Austin. It was also wonderful to have my mom, my husband and my brother Mike there with me at my defense and I would like to thank them all for traveling to

Austin for the occasion. I would also like to thank my dad and Scott and Ruth, who in addition to all of those whom I have already mentioned, often inquired about my progress. To know that people were interested in what I was doing gave me the needed energy to keep going. Dr. Betsy Kerr at the University of Minnesota also made this dissertation possible, both because she gave me permission to use her data and more importantly because she never failed to give me thoughtful feedback even when I asked for it to be delivered quickly. Finally, I would also like to acknowledge the West Hartford Public Library who procured many books for me that I needed along the way.

# **Conversational Narrative: A Meta-Analysis of Narrative Analysis**

Publication No. \_\_\_\_\_

Susan Elizabeth Carbon, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2003

Supervisor: Carl Blyth

This dissertation is a meta-analysis of the narrative analysis methodologies of Labov and Waletzky (1967), Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002), Polanyi (1985) and Ochs and Capps (2001) using data from the Minnesota Corpus (Barnes, 1984) to test the usefulness of these methodologies. Conversational narrative was first a subject of analysis in the late 60's when Labov and Waletzky, working under the influence of structural linguistics, decided that in order to better understand narrative, one must understand its most basic form, which they felt resided in oral versions of personal experience. Since their groundbreaking 1967 study, the field of conversational narrative analysis has been dominated by structural approaches to narrative that seek to define the

structural components of a narrative and formulate an analysis based on these components. Only recently with the introduction of Ochs and Capps' methodology in 2001 has an alternative which values both the context and the interactive nature of narrative and seeks to describe the co-participant's influences on narrative been put forth. This meta-analysis suggests that there are positive and negative qualities to each of the methodologies at issue and that different methodologies are more or less appropriate for different types of data. While the structural approaches to conversational narrative suggested by Labov and Polanyi do not provide an adequate means to analyze interactive narratives, Ochs and Capps' methodology requires more extensive ethnographic information than what were available from the Minnesota corpus data. While the Ochs and Capps' approach seems overall to be the best suited for the type of data at issue in the Minnesota corpus, there are also clear benefits to be derived from applying a more structural approach. Specifically, an analysis of a narrative's Non-Storyworld clauses (as defined by Polanyi) seems to provide important insights. Moreover, these clauses can help the analyst address how interlocutors make sense of the relevance of narrative in conversational discourse, something hinted at by both Labov and Polanyi. I suggest that a combination of elements from both



structural and ethnographic approaches provides a more complete methodology with which to analyze interactive narrative data.

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Chapter 2: Review of Literature .....	6
2.1 Introduction .....	6
2.2 Minnesota corpus (Barnes, 1984) .....	10
2.3 Why Labov, Polanyi and Ochs and Capps? .....	13
2.3.1 Labov .....	15
2.3.2 Polanyi .....	17
2.3.3 Ochs and Capps .....	18
2.4 Transcription methodology .....	23
2.5 Conclusion .....	41
Chapter 3: Labov and Waletzky (1967), Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002) .....	43
3.1 Introduction .....	43
3.2 Labovian Methodology: Labov and Waletzky (1967), Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002) .....	43
3.3 Problems with Applying the Labovian Framework to Other Types of Analysis and Other Types of Data .....	68
3.3.1 Problems with Imposing the Labovian Framework on Interactive Narratives .....	70
3.3.2 Problems with the Notion of Event and Temporal Juncture .....	76
3.3.3 Problems with the Labovian Notion of Evaluation ..	89
3.4 Conclusion .....	98
Chapter 4: Polanyi (1985) .....	100
4.1 Introduction .....	100
4.2 Polanyian Methodology: Polanyi (1985) .....	100
4.3 Problems with the Polanyian Methodology .....	125

4.3.1 Problems with Applying the Polanyian Methodology to Conversational Narratives .....	125
4.3.2 Problems with the Notion of the Adequate Paraphrase.....	129
4.3.3 Limits of an approach that is Narrator Focused....	134
4.4 Conclusion .....	157
Chapter 5: Ochs and Capps (2001).....	159
5.1 Introduction.....	159
5.2 Ochs and Capps Methodology: Ochs and Capps (2001)..	159
5.3 Applying the Ochs and Capps Approach to the Minnesota Corpus .....	200
5.3.1 Benefits of the Ochs and Capps Methodology for Conversational Data .....	201
5.3.2 Intentional Fallacy in the Ochs and Capps Methodology .....	215
5.4 Conclusion .....	224

Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	226
Appendix 1 Participant Questionnaires.....	235
Appendix 2 "Oregon" .....	253
Appendix 3 "histoire-géographie" .....	313
Appendix 4 "pruneaux" .....	327
Appendix 5 "boudin" .....	334
Appendix 6 "histoire-géographie, Christine" .....	338
Appendix 7 "le grec" .....	351
Appendix 8 "soupe" .....	354
Appendix 9 "lire les mains" .....	357
Appendix 10 "Nîmes" .....	400
Appendix 11 "couscous" .....	421
Appendix 12 "rouge et vert" .....	434
Bibliography .....	437
Vita .....	442

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

This dissertation is a meta-analysis of the Narrative Analysis methodologies of Labov and Waletzky (1967), Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002), Polanyi (1985) and Ochs and Capps (2001) using data from the Minnesota Corpus (Barnes, 1984) to test the usefulness of these methodologies.

While the field of narrative studies is quite broad, there have been important changes in the last few decades in how discourse is being studied and so a meta-analysis of the relatively more recent techniques of conversational narrative analysis is motivated. The beginning of the last half century saw the field dominated by approaches to narrative that stemmed from the ideas set forth by structuralists. As sociolinguists are beginning to emphasize non-structural or ethnographic approaches to discourse, it is important to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of these different approaches to narrative.

Personally, this idea of doing a meta-analysis of different approaches to conversational narrative analysis was prompted by my frustration with applying the accepted Labovian structural methodology to my data. I found significant difficulty in using a structural approach to analyze interactive data. It was not until I had been researching and doing analysis within a structural

approach for a couple of years that Ochs and Capps (2001) published a new methodology for conversational narrative analysis. Because their methodology marked such a departure from previously accepted structural approaches, it seemed necessary to evaluate the differences, benefits, and deficiencies of these methodologies.

Chapter two will introduce the field of narrative analysis and the narrative analysis methodologies that will be meta-analyzed in this dissertation will be contextualized. There will also be an introduction to the Minnesota corpus as this corpus constitutes the data against which these three approaches to narrative will be tested. Once the explication of the data is complete, I will demonstrate why the three methodologies were chosen. Finally, I will discuss the transcription methodology that will be used in this dissertation.

Chapter three will provide an overview of the Labovian methodology for narrative analysis with reference to Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002). This overview will include an explication of the Labovian framework for the analysis of narrative as well as the Labovian definitions of the components of narrative structure. This will be followed by a critique of the Labovian methodology as well as some suggestions for its improvement. It will be argued that the Labovian

methodology falls short in its ability to be applied to the type of data produced within the context of everyday conversation. With this shortcoming in mind, I will propose several modifications to the methodology to make it more able to be adapted to interactive conversational data. I will also show how Labov's requirement of temporal juncture leads to the exclusion of some more controversial narrative data that I will suggest is worthy of analysis. I will also argue for a broader definition of evaluation than that proposed within the Labovian methodology. Further, I will show that Labov's methodology for analyzing narrative with its emphasis on the role of evaluation is inherently incomplete without the inclusion of an analysis of audience participation in narrative.

In Chapter four, I will give a synopsis of Polanyi's methodology for narrative analysis. I will show how it is similar and different from the Labovian approach. This will include a discussion of the narrative components defined by Polanyi as well as an illustration of her methodology of arriving at a narrative's Adequate Paraphrase through the analysis of a narrative's evaluation. This chapter also provides a critique of Polanyi's methodology and some suggestions for its improvement. It will be suggested that the division of a narrative into Polanyian independent clauses and then into propositions is unnecessarily complicated given that it does not aid the analyst to arrive at a

better analysis. I will also demonstrate how Polanyi's concept of the Adequate Paraphrase does not live up to its name both because her methodology does not always lead the analyst to a narrative's most relevant information and because it excludes the effects of audience contributions to narrative. Finally, the issue of audience participation will be further evaluated and it will be argued that Polanyi's methodology could be improved with a mechanism to analyze the effects of Non-Storyworld clauses on narrative. I will propose such a mechanism and suggest that it allows for a better understanding of the interactional component of conversational narrative.

Chapter five will analyze an approach to narrative analysis that is quite different from the previous two approaches. I will give an overview of Ochs and Capps' more content based and context sensitive methodology to the analysis of conversational narrative. This will include an explication and illustration of each of Ochs and Capps' five narrative dimensions. An overview of their methodology will be followed by a discussion of the benefits and drawbacks of such an approach to narrative. It will be suggested that the main benefit of their methodology is the ease with which it can be applied to the type of interactive conversational narrative data of the type found in the Minnesota corpus. In particular, I will propose that because Ochs and Capps' framework allows for



an analysis of audience participation and reaction, it becomes plausible to explore the differences in audience reaction that result when that audience is presented with narratives from different narrators. However, it will also be argued that the lack of structure inherent in Ochs and Capps' approach is also a source of weakness in their methodology. I will suggest that because the possibilities within the narrative dimensions proposed by Ochs and Capps are designed to represent points on a continuum, such possibilities are inherently open to interpretation and analytical conclusions cannot be thought of as definitive. I argue that the dimensions of moral stance and tellability are especially vulnerable to the intentional fallacy.

## **Chapter 2: Review of Literature**

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter will provide a general overview of how narrative has been studied historically both outside and inside the field of linguistics. The narrative analysis methodologies at issue in this dissertation will be contextualized within the very broad range of studies on narrative. It will be shown why these particular methodologies were chosen for analysis and how the data to be analyzed in this dissertation influenced those choices.

Because of its ubiquitousness in society, narrative has been the subject of many studies in a wide range of disciplines. All types of narrative from literature to folk tales to conversational narratives of the type in focus in this dissertation have been the subject of countless explorations. While I will not provide a full history of narrative analysis endeavors, I will attempt here to situate where in the history of narrative analysis the three methodologies in this dissertation belong. Two of the methodologies in this dissertation are structural in nature. Both Labov and Polanyi seek to define the structural components that make up an oral narrative. They then base their analyses on the narrative components that they have defined. However, long before narrative was a subject of interest for the linguist, fictional

narratives were studied. Such literary studies of narrative have also had structural components of narrative as their foundation. Wallace Martin's 1985 book *Recent Theories of Narrative* provides a good overview of the study of narrative in literature and Toolan (1988) outlines the beginnings of the linguistic study of narrative in his book *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. Both of these books provide an overview of structural approaches to narrative such as those proposed by Propp (1958), Barthes (1966), and Prince (1973). These studies provided the basis for the methodologies suggested by Labov and Polanyi for conversational narratives. Also providing a critique of structural approaches to narrative, in which the works of Labov and Polanyi are discussed, is Suzanne Fleischman's book *Tense and Narrativity* (1990).

In brief, under the influence of structuralists and Chomskyan generative grammars, narrative analysts created story grammars. However, though Chomsky (1957) was able to decipher the structures underlying ambiguous sentences based on his understanding of the structure of unambiguous sentences, story grammarians were not able to do so as well. Martin (1986:103-104) points out that while the structural analysis of narrative would ideally be able to show how a single surface structure could be linked to as many deep structures as there are interpretations of a narrative, narrative analysts have tended to overlook surface

ambiguities and to assign one structural description to stories that have multiple possible interpretations.

Propp's methodology in particular became the source of inspiration for Labov and Waletzky in the creation of their approach, and constitutes one of the few references for their 1967 article. Propp attempted to describe and classify the surface structure of a story and to reduce if not eliminate subjective interpretations that could distract him from arriving at a story's abstract form. Rather than basing his analyses on surface elements such as stories about kings or stories about foreigners or stories about animals, for instance, Propp sought to identify function and context, or relations between elements as opposed to the elements themselves. Thus, in Propp's methodology, function determines meaning, with the implication that verbs or actions are more structurally significant than nouns or individuals. These ideas are adopted by Labov and Waletzky and later by Polanyi.

Ochs and Capps approach to narrative analysis, on the other hand, is an ethnographic approach that rather than being based on the definition of the structural components of narrative, is interested instead in determining how narrative functions in conversation. Their approach is one that relies much more on the context of narrative and helps the analyst to draw different conclusions from the study of a particular narrative. Rather than

having structure as its focus, Ochs and Capps' methodology looks at both content and interaction. They suggest that "the content and direction that narrative framings take are contingent upon the narrative input of other interlocutors, who provide, elicit, criticize, refute, and draw inferences from facets of the unfolding account" (2001: 2-3). To do this, they draw upon the work of Bakhtin (1986) who suggests that readers, in reading a text, take on the role of author in their creation of their own reactive text. Ochs and Capps (2001) state:

In conversational narrative, Bakhtin's ideas about literary dialogue are realized more intensely in that actual, continuous dialogue allows interlocutors to go beyond responding to an already inscribed ("ready-made") text to collaboratively inscribe turn by turn one or more narrative texts (3).

It is appropriate to ask, from all of the work on narrative that has been done, why I would choose these three particular narrative analysis methodologies to explicate and critique? I have chosen methodologies that represent attempts in the history of narrative analysis to deal with narratives of personal experience, ending with a focus on narratives of personal experience that are conversational in nature. The reasons behind these choices have to do with the nature of the data to be analyzed in this dissertation. Therefore, in order to start to answer this question in more detail, I must first explain the type of narrative data with which this project deals.

## **2.2 MINNESOTA CORPUS (BARNES, 1984)**

Before a discussion of the methodologies that will be analyzed using the narratives of the Minnesota corpus, we must first look at the corpus itself. The corpus on which this research is based is an audio recording of three separate sessions of spontaneous, free conversation in French of about six hours in length along with its corresponding transcription. There are four participants: Betsy, Martine, Christine and Evelyne. It should be noted that there exist two additional sessions in the complete Minnesota Corpus in which there appear two additional participants. However, all references to the corpus in this dissertation will refer only to the first three sessions. See Appendix 1 for each respondent's information form. Christine and Evelyne are native speakers of French. Christine is 21 years old and is from Saint-Denis, France. She lists herself as being from the working class. Evelyne is 27 years old and is from Bourges, France. She lists herself as being between the middle and upper classes. Martine is 24 years old and is a native speaker of French and Arabic. She was born in Algiers, Algeria and moved to France at age seven. Martine came to the United States at the age of 21. Martine lists herself as being part of the upper middle class. Betsy is American and a native speaker of English who speaks French as a second language. All of the speakers are female. The three native French

speakers were all graduate students who knew each other prior to the conversations making up the corpus as well as instructors of French at an American university. The native English speaker is a university professor who was responsible for organizing these sessions and recording the conversations. It should be noted that while the native English speaker does take part in the conversations to some degree, her participation does not equal that of the French speakers. During large portions of the conversations she does not speak. The conversations take place in the home of the professor who is collecting the data. It should also be noted that while the ultimate goal of the conversations is the collection of data, the conversations are light-hearted in nature with the communicative goals seeming to be primarily sociability and entertainment. There are no overly serious discussions, and there are also no sad or negative topics explored by the participants. Martine's speech seems to dominate the conversations, and in this sense she clearly does her part at keeping the talk going in light of the knowledge that Betsy needs discourse to analyze. In this way the setting may be an influence on the sociability of the discussion.

Johnstone (1996) notes a similar phenomenon in the analysis of the discourse at an academic conference. In describing the speech of two of the participants in a round-table discussion, she suggests that "their behavior suggested that both were more

attuned to the process of discussion - the exchange of ideas - than to the goal of the discussion - suggesting answers for the preset questions" (87). Like the speakers in our corpus, Martine in particular, these speakers were even more interested that the discussion at the conference be maintained than they were in the resolution of the discussion. The process was more important than the outcome. In a similar sense, Martine, Christine and Evelyne are not getting together at Betsy's house so that they can socialize. They are getting together so that they can participate in a research project. However, even given the overriding importance of the data collection as the primary goal, it is also true that the nature of these conversations is social, and it is this goal that will be understood as the basis for analysis in this dissertation.

The Minnesota corpus contains a large selection of co-constructed narratives. Previous structural research on oral narrative (Labov and Waletzky, 1967; Labov 1972) has sought to gather a large number of narratives in fairly controlled settings and under fairly controlled circumstances, and thus has used narrative elicitation methods in the context of the sociolinguistic interview. However, as noted by Milroy (1987) and others (Holmes, 1997; Küntay and Ervin-Tripp, 1997; Schegloff, 1997), since narratives produced in the context of an interview are different than those which are produced in naturally occurring conversation, interviews



alone are inadequate as a means of collecting oral narrative data, particularly when the analytical focus is interactive. Therefore, I am using a corpus of spontaneous conversation as the basis for my analysis. I also have an added advantage in objectivity because I am using data that were collected by someone else which contains the discourse of people of whom I have no social knowledge. Ferrara (1994) notes that

Analyzing the speech interaction of those to whom the researcher is not intimately known or related, or with whom the researcher has extended social contacts, in conversations in which one is not a participant, forces the researcher to rely on the internal evidence of the data themselves to gain access to the hearer's interpretations and the speaker's interpretations, that is, to be discourse-driven. Analysts with nonparticipant status cannot appeal to privileged knowledge of the situation or intentions and are less likely to have discourse analysis colored by ongoing social relationships with the people involved or by possible subjective reaction to memories or feelings evoked by their participation in the speech interactions (20).

### **2.3 WHY LABOV, POLANYI AND OCHS AND CAPPS?**

The data at issue in this dissertation are the conversational narrative data contained within the Minnesota corpus. Therefore I immediately made the decision to start my search for methodologies with those that had as their goal the analysis of interactive narratives. The three methodologies to be analyzed, Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002);

Polanyi (1985); and Ochs and Capps (2001), all represent attempts to analyze conversational narrative. Martin (1986) noted:

By changing the definition of what is being studied, we change what we see; and when different definitions are used to chart the same territory, the results will differ, as do topographical, political, and demographic maps, each revealing one aspect of reality by virtue of disregarding all others (15).

Such a statement crystalizes the reasoning behind my efforts to show the results of these three methodologies being applied to the data within the Minnesota corpus. At issue in this dissertation are how the application of each methodology leads to a different view of the narratives at hand. Such an endeavor is necessary because while cartographers really know clearly the difference, for example, between viewing the world through a political map and a topographical map, narratologists for the most part have only been using one type of map to view and analyze all narrative data. Structural approaches to narrative have dominated the field and the use of this one and only lens has led to a distorted and incomplete view of the data. Therefore, this dissertation will attempt to demonstrate that the use of different methodologies or maps for narrative analysis will lead to a clearer picture of the different facets of the narratives at issue.

### 2.3.1 Labov

The beginning of a focus on analyses of conversational narratives occurred with Labov and Waletzky (1967). It is only since Labov and Waletzky's groundbreaking study that an emphasis in narrative analysis has been placed on what they termed *oral versions of personal experience*. This set their study apart from more traditional work on narrative that was more literary or folkloric in nature. Labov and Waletzky (1967) explain:

Most attempts to analyze narrative have taken as their subject matter the more complex products of long-standing literary or oral traditions. Myths, folk tales, legends, histories, epics, toasts and sagas seem to be the results of the combination and evolution of simpler elements; they contain many cycles and re-cycles of basic narrative structures; in many cases, the evolution of a particular narrative has removed it so far from its originating function that it is difficult to say what its present function is.

In our opinion, it will not be possible to make very much progress in the analysis and understanding of these complex narratives until the simplest and most fundamental narrative structures are analyzed in direct connection with their originating functions. We suggest that such fundamental structures are to be found in oral versions of personal experiences: not the products of expert story tellers that have been re-told many times, but the original productions of a representative sample of the population (12).

In other words, Labov and Waletzky consider oral versions of personal experience to comprise the simplest and therefore the canonical form of narrative. They claim that it is only through an understanding of these narratives that analyses can then be

performed on other types of narrative that deviate from the basic form. Therefore, given that Labov and Waletzky (1967) started the movement towards an analysis of actual narratives produced by actual people, it makes sense for their methodology to serve as my starting point. The Labovian methodology is based upon the opinion that the elicitation techniques used in the context of the sociolinguistic interview produced data that mirrored the types of narratives that occur naturally in conversation. Labov (1997) notes:

The effort to observe how speakers talked when they were not being observed created the Observer's Paradox. Among the partial solutions to that paradox within the face-to-face interview, the elicitation of narratives of personal experience proved to be the most effective. We were therefore driven to understand as much as we could about the structure of these narratives and how they were introduced into the everyday conversation that our interviews simulated (1).

While, as we will see in depth in Chapter 3, the Labovian methodology falls short in its ability to describe narratives that occur in everyday conversation, it was the first methodology that had such narratives in mind as it was being formulated. Therefore, in a meta-analysis of narrative analysis methodologies designed to handle conversational narratives, the Labovian methodology represents the most logical starting point.

Another important reason to start with the Labovian narrative analysis methodology is because it represents an

approach that was largely influenced by the grammatical theories of the day. Labov's premise that there is a basic narrative structure owes much to the structuralist ideas of the time. The fact that this approach has been so widely adopted and applied even today provides the motivation for its scrutiny and thus its inclusion in this meta-analysis.

### **2.3.2 Polanyi**

Polanyi's approach to narrative analysis is the next methodology that I chose to analyze. While in many ways Polanyi's structural approach is similar to the one suggested by the Labovian methodology, she makes one crucial advance by using conversational narrative data. Polanyi states, "Talk containing conversational stories is composed of a number of clauses only some of which have their reference inside a storyworld" (31). To accommodate such clauses that do not constitute part of the storyworld, Polanyi introduced the concept of the Non-Storyworld clause. Polanyi states:

It is very important to separate out the non-storyworld propositions from storyworld events and states. Proceeding through the text on a clause-by-clause basis is the only way to make sure that the temporal interpretation of each clause is assessed correctly. This assures that the non-storyworld talk is seen to be distinct from storyworld events and states, permitting an analyst to "find the story in all the talk" -- a non-trivial problem for those working with conversational stories of the sort we shall be examining (18).

Even though Polanyi's focus is still on narrative structure and the inclusion of the Non-storyworld clause as a category merely represents a way for her to filter out that which she does not wish to treat within her analysis, the acknowledgement of the existence of such Non-storyworld clauses allows for interactive conversational narrative data to be better treated. Thus, this methodology provides an important improvement over the Labovian approach and therefore constitutes a logical next step as a methodology for meta-analysis.

### **2.3.3 Ochs and Capps**

One of the most recent approaches to narrative analysis is the final methodology for meta-analysis. In their 2001 book *Living Narrative* Ochs and Capps suggest a methodology for narrative analysis that is quite different from the approaches suggested by Labov and Polanyi. Rather than having structure as their focus, Ochs and Capps base their analyses on a series of narrative dimensions whose features are not precise but rather have a range of possibilities. Such an approach is in line with the more recent sociolinguistic literature that is more focused on discourse in context and allows for analyses that look both at the narrator and the co-participants. Therefore, before continuing, I will provide some background of this movement in sociolinguistics in general

and narrative studies in particular towards analyses that are context dependent.

Holmes (1997), Küntay and Ervin-Tripp (1997), Schegloff (1997), and Ochs and Capps (2001) have stressed the need for an analysis of narratives which occur naturally in conversation as opposed to those which are elicited. Küntay and Ervin-Tripp point out that the narratives elicited by Labov and Waletzky are not typical in that they represent the tellers' most shaped, retold and dramatic stories. In some instances, according to Küntay and Ervin-Tripp, narratives may even lack temporal juncture. Such a narrative is possible in what they term *rounds*, which are occasions in which certain elements of the background or context can be taken for granted. This would be the case for example, if neighbors who had both experienced an earthquake were relaying individual experiences. In such a context, it would be unnecessary to start off the narrative with a statement such as "There was an earthquake . . .". Another narrative type which Küntay and Ervin-Tripp find does not fit the Labov and Waletzky model is the *problem solving story*. In narratives of this type, the narrator presents an unresolved conflict, which is followed by their solicitation of alternative outcomes from the co-participants. Schegloff (1997) further remarks that Labov and Waletzky ignored jointly told narratives in their analysis. He suggests that in most cases stories

are co-constructed because they are always shaped by an orientation to the very specific context at hand. Elements of context which influence speech include the following: who the recipients are; how many of them there are; who they are to one another and to the teller; and what they can (or should) know. Given this element of co-construction, Schegloff contends that Labov and Waletzky obscured part of what is involved in a narrative's very constitution by setting their formative examination in the context of the sociolinguistic interview. This sentiment is echoed by Ferrara (1994) in her contention that there are myriad factors that must be taken into account when analyzing discourse:

"some of the factors that play a part are the setting or scene, participants, ends (both goals/purposes and outcomes), act characteristics (both the form and content of what is said), key (tone, manner, or spirit of what is said), instrumentalities (channel and code), norms of interaction and interpretation, and genres (categories or types of speech act and speech event) (14).

It seems clear that not all of these factors would remain constant in both the setting of a sociolinguistic interview and a setting where more spontaneous discourse was taking place, discourse that would take place whether or not the tape recorder was there. Holmes also stresses the importance of the co-participants in the analysis of narrative. Like Labov and Waletzky, she emphasizes the importance of the evaluative component of narrative but states that unpacking the underlying message of a



narrative is often only possible for researchers who have conducted extensive ethnographic research, and are thus able to supply the necessary contextual detail.

In the past decade, there has been considerable attention to research approaches that are interactional and more conscious of the context in the analysis of discourse (Duranti and Goodwin, 1992). This literature shows us that there is a significant amount of analysis which can only be performed when a more complete context of the discourse is known. It is of course impossible to know all aspects of the context of any given situation for it would encompass too many sets of knowledge. This point is illustrated by Johnstone (1990):

Storytelling, like any other sort of language use, is always situated in a context involving particular speakers and hearers, and specific rhetorical tasks. In other words, what a story sounds like is a function of who is telling it, who its audience is, and what the purpose of the telling is. Each of these factors is complex and multifaceted, so that a complete explanation of why a given story sounds the way it does would have to include a complete description of its teller and his or her linguistic competences (including, for example, a description of all the varieties of English he or she makes use of); a complete description of the audience, the audience's linguistic competences and the audience's reasons for listening; and a complete account of what the speaker intends the interaction to accomplish, and what the audience interprets it to mean (61).

Obviously information of this scope is impossible to obtain. However, it seems best if every effort is made to know as much as possible about the context of the data that one is using and to be

aware of the inherent limitations of the data when doing any type of analysis.

Goodwin and Goodwin (1992) use narrative to illustrate an approach to discourse analysis which includes an analysis both of the narrator and the co-participants. Their focus is the collaborative nature of interaction, particularly with respect to assessments. They suggest that this type of collaboration is especially salient in the telling of a story, in which assessments or evaluation are frequent. They propose the idea that talk marked with an assessment is not treated simply as a description, but rather as something that can be responded to and participated in before the completion of the utterance.

Ochs and Capps (2001) have gone so far as to propose a new framework with which to approach the study of conversational narrative. Instead of isolating a set of distinctive features that always characterize narrative à la Labov, they have formulated a series of "dimensions that will always be *relevant* to a narrative, even if not elaborately manifest . . . Each narrative dimension establishes a range of possibilities, which are realized in particular narrative performances" (19). Ochs and Capps' approach to narrative was designed to accommodate narratives that are interactional, narratives in which the context must be considered.

They describe the type of narratives that form the basis of their methodology:

*Living Narrative* focuses on ordinary social exchanges in which interlocutors build accounts of life events, rather than on polished narrative performances. The narrators are not renowned storytellers, and their narratives are not entertaining anecdotes, well-known tales or definitive accounts of a situation. Rather, many of the narratives under study in this volume seem to be launched without knowing where they will lead. In these exchanges, the narrators often are bewildered, surprised, or distressed by some unexpected events and begin recounting so that they may draw conversational partners into discerning the significance of their experiences. Or, narrators may start out with a seamless rendition of events only to have conversational partners poke holes in their story. In both circumstances, narrative are shaped and reshaped turn by turn in the course of conversation (2).

Because the narrative data in the Minnesota corpus is very interactive an approach such as the one put forth by Ochs and Capps seems an appropriate methodology to be applied. The Ochs and Capps' methodology is also a logical last step in this meta-analysis because it represents some of the newest ideas in narrative analysis, ideas that are very different from the focus on structure that have dominated the field.

## **2.4 TRANSCRIPTION METHODOLOGY**

The importance of a transcript used in discourse analysis should not be underestimated. Ochs (1979) has pointed out that every choice made in transcribing discourse represents a theoretical choice by the researcher. The goals of the researcher

influence these choices, choices that will shape both how the researcher and all eventual readers of the research will perceive it. In an attempt to represent as closely as possible the conversations as they occurred, I have re-transcribed the sections of the Minnesota corpus that are illustrated in this dissertation. This retranscription was necessary for several reasons. The transcript that was produced when the corpus was collected can best be assessed as rough. Many of the turns of talk were omitted and therefore speech was not truly represented as it occurred. There were also no line numbers; the transcript read as though it were the script for a play so the only way to refer to the transcript is through page numbers. Since one of the goals of this dissertation is to show the importance of not only the contributions to a narrative by the primary narrator but also of those made by the other conversational participants, it was necessary to have a transcript that accurately reflected the turns at talk. I have re-transcribed all of the narratives in the corpus that will be analyzed such that each line of my re-transcription corresponds to an audibly distinct group of words which ends either with an appropriate final intonation (such as rising intonation for a question or falling intonation for a statement) or a pause. In other words, each line represents a breath group. Therefore, a line does not always correspond to a complete grammatical phrase.

Paralinguistic features (in most cases laughter, but also features such as volume and rate of speech) are marked in parentheses. Parts of the recording which are inaudible are also marked in parentheses. Punctuation is only used to mark question intonation or exclamation intonation and reported speech (with ?, !, and "... " respectively). I have also tried as much as possible to indicate overlap in speech turns. Overlap is indicated when the words are in [brackets]. Line markers are indicated on the left hand side of transcribed portions of the corpus for ease of reference to specific lines of the conversation under discussion. In some of the transcription, some sections have been bolded when such sections are the point of focus. When this is done the purpose of the bolding will be explained in parentheses.

In order to better illustrate the results of my re-transcription I will provide an example of the original transcript along with its corresponding re-transcription. What follows are both the original transcript of "Oregon" as well as my re-transcription.

"Oregon" (original transcript)

M.: Oui oui, bien sûr, euh... c'était un voyage dans l'Ouest et on était dans euh...Je crois que c'était l'Orégon. Y a des ours, là-bas, en Orégon ?

B.: Oh oui !

M.: Oui, c'est ça, c'était l'Orégon ! Et euh... on faisait du camping et sur toutes les tables, il y avait écrit, euh..."Eloignez la nourriture, mettez-la dans la voiture

et la voiture, loin de la tente, des ours, les ours attaquent"...

E.: C'est sympathique, hein ?

M.: On était, on était dans un trou, y avait des des des de des genres de de montagne tout autour et alors ça attaque. Et pis euh bon on s'en va le lendemain parce qu'on restait jamais plus d'un jour dans le même endroit, c'était un voyage. On arrive un moment dans un genre de forêt dense ou en pleine nuit, c'était vraiment impressionnant. Bon, on plante la tente euh, euh, on joue au... à avec la lampe-là, on joue au, au j'sais pas aux échecs c'est... Pour manger les dames là, les pions.

E.C.: Les dames ?

M.: Au Black Gammon, au Backgammon.

C.: Au Jacquet !

M.: Je sais pas comment on dit en Français !

E.: Au Jacquet !

M.: C'est au Jacquet, ah on joue au Jacquet et euh... tout d'un coup, contre la tente, y a quelque chose là qui passe à toute vitesse! Je t'assure! Qui, qui frôle la tente, alors Bill, il fait: "Who's out there?". Et puis, I me dit: "Martine ! "mes lunettes !"

E.: Protecteur de sa femme !

M.: Oui, attends. Alors il dit.. "Martine, mes lunettes !"

M.: Mais, moi je me dis, oh qu'est-ce cet imbécile i me dit: "Mes lunettes ! Maintenant, ce qui vont nous attaquer, ils savent qu'il voit rien. Non, mais on était en pleine nuit, hein! Et puis en forêt dense, hein ! et i' me dit, mes lunettes !!!

Alors moi paralysée qui, qui, qui réagissait pas, parce j'ai dit, ça y est, là, on va nous tomber dessus. C'est la fin . Et puis, euh... bon je trouve ses lunettes...

E.: Qu'est-ce que tu es ridicule d'avoir dit ça !

M.: Et euh... après, après, il est sorti avec la lampe et il a cherché : rien. Bon, Au bout d'un moment euh... on a fini le jeu, n'est-ce pas, on on, on se couche donc euh... on va presque s'endormir quand on entend, dans les feuilles de la forêt qui venaient, qui venaient, en face de nous, c'était évident, des pas. On aurait dit des pas d'humains. Et ben, j't'assure, on est sorti, on a plié la tente, on a passé la nuit dans la voiture.

C.: Et vous avez vu c'que c'était ?

M.: On est parti à deux heures... Non, on n'a rien vu. On a vu une p'tite de rien du tout comme une grosse souris.

C.: Tu crois qu'c'était un ours ?

M.: Ben Bill, I dit qu'c'était un ours probablement. On était dans la région des ours.

C.: Oh dis donc !

B.: Oh oui ! C'est, ça peut être...(vraiment) dangereux.

M.: Ah oui ! Oui, ça peut être très dangereux, c'est pour ça i sont beaux sur les photos.

C.: Oui, mais i's attaquent pas euh... sans motif en général !

B.: En général, mais euh...

C.: Mais s'ils on très faim, euh... hein ?

M.: Et oui, mais alors I faudrait les les les les ours de la région de l'Orégon là, où il fait froid tout ça, bon ils ont faim hein.

(Minnesota Corpus: 21-22)

"Oregon" (re-transcription)

- 1 M.: oui oui bien sûr euh  
2 c'était un voyage dans l'ouest  
3 et on était dans euh  
4 je crois que c'était l'Orégon  
5 y a des ours  
6 là-bas  
7 en Orégon?
- 8 B.: oh oui
- 9 M.: oui c'est ça c'était l'Orégon!  
10 et euh  
11 on faisait du camping  
12 et sur toutes les tables  
13 il y avait écrit euh  
14 "éloignez la nourriture mettez-la dans la voiture  
15 et la voiture loin de la tente des ours les ours  
attaquent!"
- 16 B.,C.: [ (laughter) ]  
17 [c'est sympathique hein!]
- 18 M: [on était on était ]  
19 dans un trou



20 y avait des des des de des genres de de  
montagne tout autour

21 et alors

22 ça attaque

23 et pis euh bon on s'en va le lendemain parce  
qu'on restait jamais plus d'un jour dans le même  
endroit c'était un voyage

24 on arrive un moment dans un genre de forêt  
dense

25 en pleine nuit

26 c'était vraiment impressionnant

27 bon on plante la tente euh

28 on joue au

29 à avec la lampe-là

30 on joue au

31 au c'est pas aux échecs c'est

32 manger les dames là

33 les pions

34 B.: les [dames? ]

35 M: [au black] gammon backgammon

36 C: au ja[quet! ]

37 M: [je sais] pas comment [on dit en français]

38 E: [au jacquet! ]

39 M: c'est au jaquet

40           ah on joue au jacquet  
 41           et euh  
 42           tout d'un coup  
 43           contre la tente y a quelque chose là qui passe à  
              toute vitesse!  
 44    ?:    (laughter)  
 45    M:    je t'assure!  
 46           qui qui [frôle la     ] tente  
 47    ?:                [(laughter)]  
 48    M:    alors Bill il fait:  
 49           "who's out there?"  
 50    All:   (laughter)  
 51    M:    et puis il me dit  
 52           "Martine! mes lu[nettes!"]  
 53    E:                       [     pro]tecteur de sa femme!  
 54    C,B:   [ (laughter) ]  
 55    M:    [oui attends]  
 56           alors il dit ["Martine mes lunettes!"]  
 57    All:                [     (laughter)     ]  
 58    M:    mais moi je me dis mais qu'est-ce que c'est  
   imbécile  
 59           il me dit "mes lunettes!" maintenant il est ceux  
              qui vont nous attaquer ils savent qu'il voit rien  
 60    All:   (loud laughter)

61 M: non mais on était en pleine nuit  
 62 et puis en forêt dense  
 63 et il me dit "mes lunettes!"  
 64 [oh (inaudible) qui avait frôlé la tente alors moi  
 paralysée qui qui réagissait]  
 65 All: [ (laughter) ]  
 66 M: parce que j'ai dit ça y est là  
 67 on va nous tomber dessus  
 68 (laughter)  
 69 [c'est la fin et puis euh bon]  
 70 All: [ (laughter) ]  
 71 M: [je trouve ses lunettes]  
 72 E: [qu'est-ce que  
 ]tu es ridicule d'avoir dit ça!  
 73 M: et euh  
 74 après après  
 75 il est sorti avec la lampe  
 76 et il est cherché  
 77 rien  
 78 bon  
 79 au bout d'un moment euh  
 80 on a fini le jeu n'est-ce pas  
 81 on on on se couche donc euh

82 on va presque s'endormir  
83 quand on entend  
84 (makes sound of footsteps)  
85 dans les feuilles de la forêt  
86 qui venaient  
87 C: [oui]  
88 M: [qui ] venaient en face de nous  
89 c'était évident  
90 des pas  
91 on aurait dit des pas d'humains  
92 eh ben je t'assure on est sorti on a plié la tente  
on a passé la nuit dans la voiture  
93 C: et vous avez vu ce que c'était?  
94 M: on est parti à deux heures  
95 non on n'a rien vu  
96 on a vu une petite de rien du tout comme une  
grosse souris  
97 E: [ (laughter) ]  
98 C: [tu crois que c'était un ours?]  
99 M: [ben Bill il dit que c'était  
un ours probablement on était on était dans on était  
dans]  
100 ? [ (inaudible)  
|

101 M: la région des ours  
 102 C: oh dis donc  
 103 B: oh oui! c'est  
 104 ça peut être  
 105 vraiment dangereux  
 106 M: ah oui! oui ça peut être très dangereux c'est  
 pour ça ils sont beaux sur les photos  
 107 C: oui mais ils attaquent pas euh  
 108 [sans motif en général]  
 109 M: [ (inaudible) ]  
 110 B: en général mais  
 111 C: mais si ils ont très faim euh  
 112 hein?  
 113 M: et oui  
 114 [mais alors il faudrait]  
 115 ? [ (inaudible) ]  
 116 M: les les les les ours de la région de l'Orégon là où  
 il fait froid tout ça  
 117 bon ils ont faim hein!

"Oregon" (translation of re-transcription)

1 M.: yes yes of course uh  
 2 it was a trip west

3           and we were in uh  
4           I think that it was Oregon  
5           are there bears  
6           there  
7           in Oregon?  
8    B.:    oh yes  
9    M.:    yes that's it it was Oregon!  
10          and uh  
11          we were camping  
12          and on all the tables  
13          it was written uh  
14          "keep food away put it in the car  
15          and the car far from the tent bears bears  
attack!"  
16   B.,C.:       [    (laughter)    ]  
17                   [ oh that's nice!  ]  
18   M:         [we were we were]  
19          in a valley  
20          there were some some some some some sort of  
            mountains all around  
21          and so  
22          they attack

23           and then uh so we left the next day because we  
              never stayed more than one day in the same  
              place it was a trip  
 24           at one point we arrived in a very thick forest  
 25           in the middle of the night  
 26           it was truly remarkable  
 27           so we pitch our tent uh  
 28           we play  
 29           in in the lantern light  
 30           we play  
 31           it isn't checkers it's  
 32           take the pieces  
 33           the pieces  
 34    B.:    the [women?]  
 35    M:       [ black ] gammon backgammon  
 36    C:    ja[quet! ]  
 37    M:       [I don't] know how[to say it in French]  
 38    E:                           [    jacquet!            ]  
 39    M:    it's jacquet  
 40           ah we are playing jacquet  
 41           and uh  
 42           all of a sudden  
 43           against the tent there was something there that  
              was going by quickly!

44     ?:     (laughter)  
 45     M:     I assure you!  
 46             that that [brushed the] tent  
 47     ?:             [ (laughter) ]  
 48     M:     so Bill he goes:  
 49             "who's out there?"  
 50     All:    (laughter)  
 51     M:     and then he tells me  
 52             "Martine! my [glasses!]"  
 53     E:             [        pro]tecting his wife!  
 54     C,B:   [ (laughter) ]  
 55     M:     [yes wait]  
 56             so he says ["Martine my glasses!"]  
 57     All:             [        (laughter)        ]  
 58     M:     but I say to myself who is this imbecile  
 59             saying to me "my glasses!" now whatever is going  
            to attack us doesn't know that he can't see  
 60     All:    (loud laughter)  
 61     M:     no but we were in the middle of the night  
 62             and also in a thick forest  
 63             and he says to me "my glasses!"  
 64             [oh (inaudible) who had brushed the tent so me  
            paralysed who was reacting]



65 All: [ (laughter) ]  
66 M: because I said this is it  
67 it's going to come down on us  
68 (laughter)  
69 [this is the end and then uh so]  
70 All: [ (laughter) ]  
71 M: [I find his glasses]  
72 E: [how  
ridiculous you are to have said that!]  
73 M: and uh  
74 after after  
75 he left with the lantern  
76 and he looked  
77 nothing  
78 so  
79 after a moment uh  
80 we finished the game right  
81 we we we go to sleep therefore uh  
82 we are almost asleep  
83 when we hear  
84 (makes sound of footsteps)  
85 in the leaves of the forest  
86 which are coming

87 C: [ yes ]

88 M: [which] are coming towards us

89 it was clearly

90 footsteps

91 one would have said human steps

92 and so I assure you we left we folded the tent we  
spent the night in the car

93 C: and did you see what it was?

94 M: we left at two o'clock

95 no we didn't see anything

96 we saw a little something like a big mouse

97 E: [ (laughter) ]

98 C: [do you think that it was a bear?]

99 M: [well Bill says that it  
was probably a bear we were in the we were in]

100 ? [(inaudible)]

101 M: the region of bears

102 C: oh really

103 B: oh yes! it's

104 it can be

105 truly dangerous

106 M: ah yes! yes it can be very dangerous and it's for  
that reason that they are beautiful in pictures

107 C: yes but they don't attack uh

108 [without a motive for the most part]  
 109 M: [ (inaudible) ]  
 110 B: for the most part but  
 111 C: but if they are very hungry  
 112 huh?  
 113 M: why yes  
 114 [but then it must be]  
 115 ? [ (inaudible) ]  
 116 M: the the the the bears in Oregon there where it is  
 cold and all  
 117 well they are hungry huh!

There are many ways in which my re-transcription varies from the original transcription. Perhaps the most noticeable substantive addition to the re-transcription is the inclusion of the representation of laughter as it occurs in the interaction. Laughter occurs on eleven separate occasions during the course of this narrative (in lines 16, 44, 47, 50, 54, 57, 60, 65, 68, 70, and 97 of the re-transcription) and remains wholly unrepresented in the original transcript. This is also the case for the other paralinguistic information such as the mimicking of footsteps in line 84 of the re-transcription or instances where there is inaudible material as in lines 64, 100, 109, and 115 of the re-transcription. There is also an instance of a turn at talk which was omitted in the

original transcript that is restored in the re-transcription. This is the case for line 87 in the re-transcription. Also omitted from the original transcript is overlap in the turns at talk, of which there are many instances. The original transcript also includes punctuation marks but there is no key to indicate the motivation behind the choices made in applying them. While there is no key to the original transcription in some cases the spelling of words seems to be modified to indicate spoken French pronunciation. For instance *i* is often substituted for *il* or *i's* for *ils*; *pis* is often found in place of *puis* or *j'sais* for *je sais* or *c'que* for *ce que*. In the original transcript there is also no standard convention for indicating pauses. Sometimes a pause is indicated by an ellipses ( . . . ) and other times it is indicated with a comma. Pauses are also indicated in the original transcript with sentence-final punctuation marks such as periods (.) or exclamation points (!), or question marks (?). To further confuse matters there are sometimes commas in the original transcription that do not correspond to a pause in the speech, but rather seem to be included because they would be expected in grammatically correct written speech. For instance in the original transcription Martine has the following turn at talk:

M.: C'est au Jacquet, ah on joue au Jacquet et euh... tout d'un coup, contre la tente, y a quelque chose là qui passe à toute vitesse! Je t'assure! Qui, qui frôle la tente, alors Bill, il

fait: "Who's out there?". Et puis, I me dit: "Martine ! "mes lunettes !"

Notice that between the phrases *contre la tente* and *y a quelque chose là qui passe à toute vitesse!* there is a comma. A break between these two phrases is expected but does not exist on the tape. There is also no pause between *Bill* and *il fait* on the tape, although there is a comma in the original transcript. Therefore, it is impossible to accurately interpret the punctuation marks in the original transcript. Additionally, there are instances in the original transcript where a pause that does exist is not represented. There is a pause between *Jacquet* and *et euh* that is not represented in the original transcript. In creating the re-transcription I avoided all use of punctuation that was not directly justified by the intonation of the speakers. In the re-transcription only question marks, exclamation points, and quotation marks are used. Pauses are indicated with a new line.

## **2.5 CONCLUSION**

Now that I have introduced the data against which the three methodologies will be tested, I turn to a more complete look at the methodologies themselves. Chapter 3 will explicate the Labovian approach to narrative analysis. This explication will be followed by a critique of the methodology. Chapter 4 will look at the Polanyian methodology and the limitations of its improvements over the Labovian methodology. And Chapter 5 will demonstrate the

methodology proposed by Ochs and Capps as well as provide a discussion of both the usefulness and the drawbacks of this approach.

## **Chapter 3: Labov and Waletzky (1967), Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002)**

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

The methodology initially proposed in Labov and Waletzky's 1967 study and further revised by Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002) has been one of the most widely accepted in the field of Narrative Analysis. This chapter will discuss some of the problems which arise in trying to apply this methodology to conversational narrative. In particular the notions of *event*, *temporal juncture* and *evaluation* as defined in the Labovian framework will be tested.

### **3.2 LABOVIAN METHODOLOGY: LABOV AND WALETZKY (1967), LABOV (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002)**

As was discussed in section 2.1, many studies of narrative have strived to define and capture an ideal or prototypical narrative, a goal consistent with a structuralist framework. This literature, which includes Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972), attempts to define the structural components of narrative, thereby suggesting what is necessary for an ideal or prototypical narrative. Such structuralist approaches differ from more ethnographic approaches that will be seen later in the illustration of Ochs and Capps' methodology in Chapter 5.

To illustrate the Labovian methodology for narrative analysis I will use Labov and Waletzky's narrative Number 1 "Old Doc Simon", repeated below. I have chosen to use one of Labov and Waletzky's narratives to illustrate their definition of the basic framework of narrative because of the difficulty in applying their framework to an interactive narrative of the kind contained in my data. These difficulties will be discussed at length later on in this chapter with reference to narratives from the Minnesota corpus.

(Were you ever in a situation where you thought you were in serious danger of getting killed?) I talked a man out of -- Old Doc Simon I talked him out of pulling the trigger. (What happened?)

Well, in the business I was associated at that time, the Doc was an old man... He had killed one man, or -- had done time. But he had a -- young wife, and those days I dressed well. And seemingly she was trying to make me.

I never noticed it. Fact is, I didn't like her very well, because she had -- she was a nice looking girl until you saw her feet. She had big feet. Jesus, God, she had big feet!

Then she left a note one day she was going to commit suicide because he was always raising hell about me. He came to my hotel. Nice big blue 44, too.

I talked him out of it; and says, "Well, we'll go look for her, and if we can't find her, well you can -- go ahead, pull the trigger if you want to." I was maneuvering.

So he took me up on it. And we went to where they found her handkerchief -- the edge of a creek -- and we followed down a little more, and we couldn't find anything. An got back -- it was a tent show -- she was laying on a cot with an ice bag on her head. She hadn't committed suicide.



But -- however -- that settled it for the day. But that night the manager, Floyd Adams, said, "You better pack up and get out because that son of a bitch never forgives anything once he gets it in his head."

And I did. I packed up and got out. That was two.

That was two.

After I came out from New York ...

(Labov and Waletzky, 1967: 14)

Labov and Waletzky's main goal for narrative analysis was to come up with a structural definition of narrative. They suggested that the best way to accomplish this goal was through the analysis of oral versions of personal experience. The use of such narratives for analysis represented a major breakthrough in narrative studies at the time. Up until this point, most studies of narrative used data made up of the genres contained within literary or oral tradition such as myths, folktales, epics, etc. Labov and Waletzky felt as though thorough analysis of such genres would not be possible without first understanding narratives of personal experience. They state:

In our opinion, it will not be possible to make very much progress in the analysis and understanding of these complex narratives until the simplest and most fundamental narrative structures are analyzed in direct connection with their originating functions. We suggest that such fundamental structures are to be found in oral versions of personal experiences: not the products of expert story tellers that have been re-told many times, but the original

productions of a representative sample of the population (12).

At the outset, Labov and Waletzky (1967) define narrative as "one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which actually occurred" (20). Therefore, the first step in the analysis of a narrative is to determine the temporal sequence among the clauses that make up a narrative. To this end, each clause in the narrative is assigned a sequential symbol represented by the letters of the alphabet as illustrated with "Old Doc Simon" here.

- a Well, in the business I was associated at that time, the Doc was an old man...
- b He had killed one man,
- c or - had done time.
- d But he had a young wife
- e and those days I dressed well.
- f And seemingly, she was trying to make me.
- g I never noticed it.
- h Fact is, I didn't like her very well, because she had - she was a nice looking girl until you saw her feet.
- i She had big feet.
- j Jesus, God, she had big feet!
- k Then she left a note one day  
she was going to commit suicide

because he was always raising hell about me.

l He came to my hotel. Nice big blue 44 too.

m I talked him out of it,

n and says, "Well, we'll go look for her,

o and if we can't find her, well, you can -- go ahead, pull  
the trigger if you want to."

p I was maneuvering.

q So he took me up on it.

r And we went to where they found her handkerchief --  
the edge of a creek--

s And we followed down a little more,

t And we couldn't find anything.

u And got back -

v it was a tent show -

w she was laying on a cot with an ice bag on her head.

x She hadn't committed suicide.

y But - however - that settled it for the day.

z But that night the manager, Floyd Adams, said, "You  
better pack up

aa and get out,

because that son of a bitch never forgives anything  
once he gets it in his head."

bb And I did.

cc I packed up

dd and got out.

ee That was two.

(Labov and Waletzky, 1967: 35-36)

Once the clauses in the narrative have been labeled, then a displacement set for each individual clause can be determined, thus establishing the temporal sequence for the narrative. Labov and Waletzky describe this process: "Each clause is then tested for the potential range of displacement by examining the semantic interpretation which results when the clause in question is moved to all possible positions in the remaining sequence" (22). The displacement sets for the clauses are represented numerically by showing how many clauses both before and after where the clause in question occurs in the temporal sequence it could appear without altering the semantic interpretation of the narrative. For instance in the first clause of the narrative, clause 0a30, the 0 means that since this is the first clause it cannot be pushed further forward in the narrative, or it may be moved up by a total of 0 clauses. The a represents the fact that it was the first clause in the original order of the narrative, with the chronology being represented alphabetically. Finally, the 30 represents the fact that this clause can be moved ahead or delayed in the sequence of narrative clauses. Specifically, it may be moved ahead by a total of 30 clauses. Since 30 is the number of clauses in the narrative,

such a displacement set means that clause a could occur anywhere in the narrative. The following is a representation of the displacement sets of all of the clauses in "Old Doc Simon".

0a30 Well, in the business I was associated at that time, the  
Doc was an old man...

1b29 He had killed one man,

2c28 or - had done time.

3d27 But he had a young wife

4e26 and those days I dressed well.

5f25 And seemingly, she was trying to make me.

6g24 I never noticed it.

7h23 Fact is, I didn't like her very well, because she had -  
she was a nice looking girl until you saw her feet.

8i22 She had big feet.

9j21 Jesus, God, she had big feet!

10k0 Then she left a note one day

she was going to commit suicide

because he was always raising hell about me.

0l0 He came to my hotel. Nice big blue 44 too.

0m3 I talked him out of it,

1n2 and says, "Well, we'll go look for her,

2o1 and if we can't find her, well, you can -- go  
ahead, pull the trigger if you want to."

3p0 I was maneuvering.

0q0 So he took me up on it.

0r0 And we went to where they found her handkerchief --  
the edge of a creek--

0s0 And we followed down a little more,

0t0 And we couldn't find anything.

0u1 And got back -

21v9 it was a tent show -

1w1 she was laying on a cot with an ice bag on her head.

12x7 She hadn't committed suicide.

1y0 But - however - that settled it for the day.

0z0 But that night the manager, Floyd Adams, said, "You  
better pack up

0aa0 and get out,

because that son of a bitch never forgives  
anything once he gets it in his head."

0bb1 And I did.

1cc0 I packed up

0dd0 and got out.

0ee0 That was two.

(Labov and Waletzky, 1967: 35-36)

Once the displacement sets of the clauses are determined, clauses can be considered as falling into four different categories: free, coordinate, restricted, and narrative. A free clause "has a displacement set equal to the entire narrative, and can range freely

through the narrative sequence" (22). In our example "Old Doc Simon" clauses a-j and v are all free clauses. They represent conditions that remain true for the entire duration of the narrative. Clauses that have identical displacement sets are termed coordinate clauses. In our example, clauses m-p have identical displacement sets and can be interchanged with one another. A restricted clause "does not range freely over the entire narrative, yet has a wider range than the narrative clause" (23). In our example, clause x is a restricted clause. It does not have a displacement set that stretches over the entire narrative and yet it can range over several narrative clauses. The fact that the woman had not committed suicide is relevant any time after clause k where she left the note indicating that she intended to do so but not before. In this sense, even though clause x has a relatively large displacement set, it is not entirely free. Finally, there is the narrative clause which has the smallest displacement set of any clause -- namely it has a displacement set of one clause and is locked into its position. Clauses l, q-t, z, aa, and dd-ee are narrative clauses in "Old Doc Simon" and cannot be moved from their positions in the temporal sequence of the narrative. Labov (1970:362) states that only independent clauses can function as narrative clauses and when there is a subordinate clause it will be listed on a separate line but be included with its independent

clause for the purposes of lettering. It should also be noted that each narrative clause has a narrative head. The narrative head is "the finite verb of a narrative clause, which carries the tense marker of the clause" (28). According to Labov and Waletzky, only simple past and simple present verbs can function as narrative heads in English.

Labov and Waletzky suggest that a narrative is made up of any sequence of clauses that contains at least one temporal juncture (i.e. contains at least two clauses that are temporally ordered with respect to one another). Labov and Waletzky (1967) explain:

A statement such as "I shot and killed him" would be a narrative, because it contains a temporal juncture, but not "I laughed and laughed at him." There are many ambiguous cases that allow two distinct interpretations: "I punched him in the head, the mouth and the chest" is normally a list, which does not imply that he was punched first in the head, then in the mouth, and then in the chest. But the temporal interpretation is possible, and it is more likely in "I beat him up and stomped on him"(28).

In 1997 Labov created a new element that he terms the sequential clause. Labov defines a sequential clause as "a clause that can be an element of a temporal juncture" (3). Such clauses could be either restricted or narrative. Labov goes on to state that "sequential clauses are headed by verbs in the preterit tense, past progressive, or the present tense with the semantic interpretation of a preterit (historical present)" (3). Another feature of the



sequential clause is that it cannot be part of the abstract, orientation, or coda of a narrative. Narratives with just one instance of temporal juncture are referred to as minimal narratives (Labov, 1972:360). Temporal juncture is necessary according to Labov and Waletzky because they contend that one of the functions of narrative is to verbally recapitulate an experience. They term this the referential function.

After having defined the basic framework for the analysis of narratives, Labov and Waletzky turn to the overall structure of narratives. To illustrate this aspect of their methodology I will use the narrative "histoire-géographie" from the Minnesota corpus as well as "Old Doc Simon".

In order to define the overall structure of narrative, Labov and Waletzky needed to discover all of the possible components of a narrative. They suggest that only complex narratives contain all of the elements of narrative. Fleischman (1990) notes that each element within the Labovian narrative structure answers a specific question:

- a. Abstract: what was this about?
- b. Orientation: who, what, when, where?
- c. Complicating Action: *then* what happened?
- d. Peak: what was the highpoint?
- e. Evaluation: so what?

f. Resolution: what finally happened?

g. Coda: what is the relation to the present context? (135)

Labov defines the abstract as one or two clauses at the beginning of a narrative which summarize the whole story. The abstract of "Old Doc Simon" consists of the answer to the interviewer's question *Were you ever in a situation where you thought you were in serious danger of being killed?*

I talked a man out of -- Old Doc Simon I talked him out of pulling the trigger.

Another example of an abstract comes in "boudin" (for the full text of this narrative, see Appendix 5):

1        ah! je me souviens de manger un boudin à 4h00 qui  
          était froid!

1        oh! I remember eating a cold blood sausage at 4  
          o'clock!

Orientation consists of a series of free clauses preceding the first narrative clause "that serve to orient the listener with respect to person, place, time and behavioral situation" (32). The following clauses from "histoire-géographie" (for a full text of this narrative, see Appendix 3) are all examples of orientation:

2            en histoire-géo

4            d'abord toute l'année

5            j'ai été la dernière

7            toute l'année

8           j'ai été la dernière  
 9           j'avais 2  
 10          j'avais 4  
 11          à chaque fois que Papa me disait  
 13          "mais tu as tu as pas de leçon d'histoire-géo?"  
 14          je fais "non non c'est une récitation aujourd'hui"

2           in history-geography  
 4           first of all all year  
 5           I was the last  
 7           all year  
 8           I was the last  
 9           I used to get 2  
 10          I used to get 4  
 11          and each time Papa used to tell me  
 13          "but you don't you don't have a history-  
             geography assignment?"  
 14          I go "no no it's a recitation today"

All of these clauses from "histoire-géographie" serve to orient the listener. They describe the situation that was in place in order for an understanding of the events to follow. Labov (1970:364) states that orientation sections are filled with "a great many past progressive clauses". In French narration, orientation clauses are

typically, although not always, in the imparfait. In fact, although an in depth discussion of tense goes beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is interesting to note that while all of the above clauses are examples of orientation, they exist in tenses other than imparfait. While lines 5 and 8 are in the passé composé the preceding adverbs in lines 4 and 7 *toute l'année (all year)* show that these do not constitute discrete events. Similarly in line 14, the present tense is also not interpreted as being discrete because of the preceding adverb in line 11 *chaque fois (each time)*.

The complication (also called the Complicating Action, Labov, 1970:370) is the series of events that make up the main body of the narrative. These are events that must be strictly ordered in order to maintain an accurate account of what happened, in other words they are also sequential clauses. The complication is typically encoded in French in either the passé composé or the historical present. Examples of complication from "histoire-géographie" are as follows.

- 51            pour le bac
- 52            pour les révisions
- 53            Papa m'a pris en main
- 54            et puis il m'a dit
- 56            "que pour l'histoire-géo
- 58            tu tu il faut que tu aies la moyenne"

63            alors j'ai pris mon amie  
 66            on a travaillé ensemble  
 67            le jour de l'oral je suis tombée sur le Front  
              Populaire  
  
 51            for the bac  
 52            for the revisions  
 53            Papa took charge of me  
 54            and then he said to me  
 56            "that for history-geography  
 58            you you you must have a passing grade"  
 63            so I took my friend  
 66            we worked together  
 67            the day of the oral I fell upon the Popular Front

The evaluation in a narrative can be defined as anything that contributes to explaining the significance of the narrative or why the narrative is being told and is a major component of a narrative's function, as well as being a major component of the Labovian framework. Labov and Waletzky claim that "most narratives are so designed as to emphasize the strange and unusual character of the situation" (34). Another frequent function of narrative, they suggest, is to highlight the virtues of the

narrator. They term this self-aggrandizement. Labov and Waletzky define narrative evaluation in the following way:

. . . the fundamental definition of evaluation must be semantic, although its implications are structural. The evaluation of a narrative is defined by us as that part of the narrative that reveals the attitude of the narrator towards the narrative by emphasizing the relative importance of some narrative units as compared to others (37).

Continuing with clauses from the same example, the following clauses from "histoire-géographie" constitute part of the evaluation because they establish how the narrator wants herself to be perceived so as to allow for a better understanding of the events which are about to unfold. The narrator reveals that these characterizations are important to the story by repeating them both directly (such as in the direct statements in lines 4, 5, 7, 8, and 49 where the narrator uses the 1<sup>st</sup> person pronoun with an evaluation) and indirectly (such as in lines 60-62 where the narrator refers to herself indirectly in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person).

4	d'abord toute l'année
5	j'ai été la dernière
7	toute l'année
8	j'ai été la dernière
49	alors j'étais atroce!
60	c'est pas possible
61	une fille nulle en histoire-géographie

62           qui ne sait rien

4           first of all all year

5           I was the last

7           all year

8           I was the last

49          so I was atrocious!

60          this is not possible

61          a girl who is worthless in history-geography

62          who doesn't know anything

Labov and Waletzky emphasize the role of evaluation in narratives. According to Labov and Waletzky, the evaluation is of utmost importance because narratives are usually told in answer to some stimulus from outside or to establish some point of personal interest. Thus, the evaluation section of the narrative answers the question *Why is this narrative being told?* This section of the narrative normally occurs, according to Labov and Waletzky, at the peak, the point where the complication has reached a maximum, just before the resolution, and is designed to emphasize the strange or unique character of the situation being narrated. Labov and Waletzky suggest that such an evaluation section can

many times be defined formally despite the fact that "the fundamental definition of evaluation must be semantic" (37).

In such cases they suggest that a series of multi-coordinate clauses or clauses with a displacement set of greater than one clause occurs just prior to the resolution of the narrative. In such narratives the suspense is extended thus heightening the impact of the resolution. Labov and Waletzky state that "multicoordinate clauses or groups of free or restricted clauses are frequently located at the break between the complicating action and the resolution of these complications" (35). This is the case in "histoire-géographie" in which the following free clauses fall in between the complication and the resolution.

z       et euh cette femme le Front Populaire que je savais  
          tout par coeur

aa       j'ai vraiment tout appris

bb       alors je savais bêtement évidemment

cc       je répétais des mots bêtement

dd       enfin le prof même l'analyse il nous l'avait donnée

z       and uh this woman the Popular Front that I knew all  
          by heart

aa       I truly learned it all

bb       of course I knew mechanically

cc       I repeated the words mechanically



dd and the teacher had even given us the analysis

In this example, just before revealing the surprising resolution to her narrative, Martine repeats in clauses z-dd the outcome of her unwillingness to study appropriately. Thus, the impact of the revelation that she received one of the highest grades in the class is augmented. Such a section also occurs in "Old Doc Simon" in clauses m-p.

0m3 I talked him out of it,

1n2 and says, "Well, we'll go look for her,

2o1 and if we can't find her, well, you can -- go ahead, pull the trigger if you want to."

3p0 I was maneuvering.

Here Labov and Waletzky state that "these multicoordinate clauses suspend the action at a critical moment -- when the danger of death is greatest, and they contain an explicit statement of the attitude of the narrator. His coolness in a moment of crisis emphasizes the danger and reflects well on himself " (36).

Labov later revised this relatively narrow definition of the evaluation section of a narrative when he stated that "it would be a mistake to limit the evaluation" to the point where the complication has reached a maximum "since evaluative devices are distributed throughout the narrative" (1972:369). Therefore, oftentimes clauses that are evaluative can also be part of another category such as the orientation, complication or resolution. This is the

case for the clauses in "histoire-géographie" initially illustrated as evaluation (clauses 4-5, 7-8, 49, 60-62) which are both part of the evaluation and part of the orientation. Labov and Waletzky also stress the importance of the semantic component of evaluation because they feel that it is this aspect of the evaluation in a narrative that contributes to its effectiveness:

When the subject is asked if he were ever in serious danger of being killed, and he says "Yes," then he is asked: "What happened?". He finds himself in a position in which he must demonstrate to the listener that he really was in danger. The more vivid and real the danger appears, the more effective the narrative. If the narrative is weak and uninteresting, he will have made a false claim (34).

Then, after much discussion of what evaluation looks like within specific narratives, Labov and Waletzky define evaluation semantically, formally, and culturally as follows:

Semantically defined evaluation:

1. direct statement: "I said to myself: this is it."
2. lexical intensifiers: "He was beat up real, real, bad."; "I whupped that dude half to death."

Formally defined:

3. suspension of the action:
  - a. through coordinate clauses and restricted clauses
  - b. repetition (subtype of the above)

Culturally defined:

4. symbolic action: "They put an egg on his door."; "I crossed myself."; "You could hear the rosaries clicking."

5. judgment of a third person: here the entire narrative is reported to a person not present at the narrative (37-38).

In 1972, Labov further elaborates on his definition of evaluative elements with the addition of intensifiers, comparators, correlatives, and explicatives. An intensifier is something that strengthens or intensifies a narrative event. Intensifiers include gestures, expressive phonology (such as the lengthening of vowels), quantifiers, repetition, and ritual utterances. Labov describes comparators in the following way: "Comparators, including negatives, compare the events which did occur to those which did not occur" (381). Comparators include negatives, futures, modals, questions, imperatives and comparatives. Correlatives are described as elements that "bring together two events that actually occurred so that they are conjoined in a single independent clause" (387). Correlatives include progressives, appended participles, double appositives (a knife, a long one, a dagger), double attributives (big red house, cold wet day), and left-hand participles (an unsavory-looking passenger). Finally, Labov notes that with the use of explicatives "the explication of the various complications inherent in the narrative situation" (392) can serve an evaluative function.

Another narrative element defined by Labov and Waletzky is the resolution. The resolution of a narrative is simply that which occurs after the complication and evaluation, that which resolves the narrative. In "histoire-géographie" the resolution is as follows.

ee    j'ai eu 16 ou 18

ff    enfin pas possible une des meilleures notes de de tout le groupe

ee    I got 16 or 18

ff    really not possible one of the best grades of of the whole group

It should be noted that clauses ee and ff are both resolution and evaluation. Labov and Waletzky state that "if the evaluation is the last element, then the resolution section coincides with the evaluation" (39).

Finally, the coda is a clause or series of clauses that are used to return the conversation to the present. Examples of coda phrases are things like "And that was it" or "And you know that man who picked me out of the water? He's a detective in Union City, and I see him every now and again" (Labov and Waletzky, 1967:40). "Histoire-géographie" does not have a coda, however, "Orégon" does.

bbb            c'est pour ça ils sont beaux sur les photos

bbb            it's for that reason that they are beautiful in  
                  photographs

This clause reminds the audience of the initial prompt for Martine's narrative which was a comment by Christine of a photo of a bear in a magazine that she was leafing through while they were talking. She had said, "Ça paraît tellement inoffensif l'ours" (Bears seem so harmless). Clause bbb encapsulates the entire point of the narrative into a response to Christine's initial comment.

Another example of a coda is found in the narrative "pruneaux" (for the full text of this narrative see Appendix 4). After telling a story about how she had been forced to eat a meat and prune dish that she detested, Martine wraps up the narrative with clause 62.

62    M:    depuis je n'ai [plus mangé un petit pruneaux]

62    M:    since then I have [never eaten one little prune]

In this way Martine brings her relationship with prunes up to the present by stating that she has yet to eat a single prune since this horrible event. Therefore this clause acts both as a coda and as evaluation by emphasizing how the events in the narrative have influenced her life.

In his more recent writings Labov (1997, 2001, 2002) still uses the overall framework that he and Waletzky developed in 1967. He has, however, become more interested in the event

structure of narrative and how such structure is related to the concept of reportability, and specifically the reportable events that make up narratives. This notion of reportability is central to narrative as the launching of a narrative changes the course of regular conversation in that the narrator is granted an extended turn at talk. In order for this privilege to be granted, the narrator must have something important, or reportable, to convey. As Sacks (1992:3-5) states, other members of the conversation can take turns during the telling of a narrative, but the telling of a narrative is essentially a claim to return the assignment of speakership to the narrator until the completion of the narrative. Therefore, Labov claims that when a person tells a narrative, it is usually done so in order to describe the most reportable event, defined as "an event that is the least common and has the largest consequences for the welfare and well-being of the participants". (2002:10). It is important to note that Labov recognizes that there are no fixed criteria to determine how an event becomes reportable enough to relay. Labov (1997) states:

The difficulty is that there is no absolute standard of inherent interest, and it has been proposed that in some relaxed circumstances with no competing topics, a narrative can be told that is thoroughly banal and ordinary. Given the difficulty of measuring the interest of the narrative or the competing claims, this approach to reportability itself is of limited interest. Yet the concept of "the most reportable event" is central to the organizational structure of the narrative (7).

Labov goes on to suggest that it is the inverse relationship between credibility and reportability that constitutes the central problem of narrative construction. Labov states:

The problem of establishing credibility for the most reportable event is equivalent to answering the question, "How did this [extraordinary thing] come about?" It is therefore necessary to provide an answer in the form of some preceding event which was the cause or motivation of the most reportable event. This is a recursive process: this preceding event must be explained in turn, and an answer must be provided to the question, "and what brought *that* about?" A solution to the problem of narrative construction therefore requires the narrator to locate an event in the series for which the question "Why did you [or he] do that?" is meaningless or silly (2002:11).

This process of establishing credibility for the most reportable event seems somewhat similar to Labov and Waletzky's earlier notion of the importance of evaluation in establishing the point of the narrative. Labov had postulated that using these ideas the basic procedure for creating a narrative can be summarized with the following rule: "Given an event  $r_i$ , that is unaccounted for, locate an event  $r_{i-1}$  for which the statement " $r_i$  happened because  $r_{i-1}$ " is true" (2002:11). The resulting narrative chain for "histoire-géographie" is illustrated below.

$r_0$	I got 16 or 18
$r_{-1}$	because I repeated the words mechanically on my oral exam
$r_{-2}$	because I had learned texts by heart

r-3            because I was avoiding doing my assignments

r-4            because I was terrible in histoire-géographie.

This narrative chain can be transformed into an inverse narrative chain as illustrated below

r-4            Because I was terrible in histoire-géographie

r-3            I avoided doing my assignments

r-2            so instead I learned texts by heart

r-1            so I repeated the words mechanically on my oral exam

r<sub>0</sub>            and I got 16 or 18.

Although such a chain of events is coherent, it lacks the scope of evaluation contained in the full version of the narrative. Therefore in order to understand narrative construction, Labov suggests considering how the other elements, not included in the above chain contribute to the final understanding of the narrative. Such a process allows the researcher to come to a useful starting point in the identification and analysis of evaluative material.

### **3.3 PROBLEMS WITH APPLYING THE LABOVIAN FRAMEWORK TO OTHER TYPES OF ANALYSIS AND OTHER TYPES OF DATA**

While the Labovian framework for narrative analysis represented a major breakthrough in the analysis of narrative from a linguistic standpoint and is in many ways useful and relevant today, there are some important limitations of the framework that must be acknowledged. It is certainly true that the framework



suggested by Labov and Waletzky and Labov is not well suited to treat interactional narrative data of the kind found in spontaneous discourse. This is true despite the fact that it was such data that Labov and Waletzky were trying to reproduce with their data-collection methodology. Labov (1997) notes:

The effort to observe how speakers talked when they were not being observed created the Observer's Paradox. Among the partial solutions to that paradox within the face-to-face interview, the elicitation of narratives of personal experience proved to be the most effective. We were therefore driven to understand as much as we could about the structure of these narratives and how they were introduced into the everyday conversation that our interviews simulated (1).

The inability of the Labovian framework to be easily adapted to conversational data will be demonstrated and represents a serious weakness of the framework. The requirement of temporal juncture within the Labovian framework also prevents the framework from being able to be applied to controversial narrative data. Examples of controversial narrative data from the Minnesota Corpus will be illustrated and arguments for a wider definition of a narrative will be presented. Finally and most importantly, there are also inherent weaknesses with the Labovian notion of evaluation. While the Labovian methodology stresses the centrality of the role of evaluation in demonstrating the reportability of a narrative and indicates that such evaluation is necessary to ward off the dreaded audience retort of "So what?", there is no construct within the

Labovian methodology to assess audience reaction. The rest of this chapter will illustrate these weaknesses using examples of narrative from the Minnesota corpus that are not easily analyzed with the Labovian framework.

### **3.3.1 Problems with Imposing the Labovian Framework on Interactive Narratives**

There are many problems with applying the Labovian framework for narrative analysis to interactive narratives of the type found in the Minnesota corpus. It is very difficult with the Labovian division of the narrative into clauses to maintain an accurate representation of the narrative as it occurred in real time. That is to say that the representation of a narrative that separates clauses into audibly distinct breath groups and also shows instances of speaker overlap is impossible within the Labovian methodology (for more on my preferred transcription methodology whose instances of use will be referred to as interactive representations, see Chapter 2.4). An even more significant disadvantage is the lack of a category for clauses uttered by speakers other than the primary narrator. Therefore, the Labovian framework also makes a focus on these other speakers' perspectives difficult.

It is impossible to represent speech into audibly distinct breath groups with the Labovian framework for narrative analysis. For example, in the interactive representation of "Orégon" (See

Appendix 2 for the full text of both the interactive and Labovian representations of the narrative), lines 5-7 are as follows.

5            y a des ours  
6            là-bas  
7            en Orégon?

5            are there bears  
6            there  
7            in Oregon?

This segment, in which lines 5, 6, and 7 each represent audibly distinct phrases must be collapsed into one line (line c in the Labovian analysis).

c            y a des ours là-bas en Orégon ?

Such conflation is necessary within the Labovian framework in order to appropriately fit narrative elements into categories. It seems logical that according to Labov's definition of orientation clauses which states that free clauses which precede the first narrative clause are orientation clauses, that *y a des ours là-bas en Orégon?* fits into that category. But when they are represented in a way that shows how the narrative actually unfolded line g, for instance, *en Orégon?* becomes difficult to categorize. Therefore, in order to make the analysis work, narratives must be distorted in this way.

The course of a narrative is even further obscured when there is overlap. In the segment of the interactive representation of "histoire-géographie, Christine" that follows (See Appendix 6 for the full text of both the interactive and Labovian representations of the narrative), Christine attempts to continue her narrative in lines 9 and 12

- 6 C: l'histoire-géographie surtout parce qu'on était  
nulle
- 7 M: c'était le pire l'his[toire-géographie ]
- 8 E: [ah non! J'ai eu une excellente  
note]
- 9 C: [ et alors  
]
- 10 M: ah oui mais toi t'es historienne!
- 11 E: oui c'est ça! c'est pour ça que [j'adorais ça!]
- 12 C: [et on avait]
- 13 M: l'histoire mon Dieu! mon Dieu! [c'est oh là là]

However, notice that she is interrupted by the other interlocutors. The Labovian framework does not indicate how to deal with interrupted statements that do not include enough semantic material to allow them to fit into a category. Therefore, it is necessary to combine lines of speech that are not consecutive in order for them to be characterized and categorized. Therefore, in the Labovian analysis of this narrative, lines 6, 9, and 12 of the

interactive representation are subsumed into one line (line b of the Labovian representation).

- b      l'histoire-géographie surtout parce qu'on était nulle et  
         alors et on avait

Having to include this material into one clause obscures the fact that Christine was having difficulty retaining the floor. I will return to this issue later in section 3.3.3 in the discussion of how reportability and evaluation must include an assessment of the audience members' contributions.

Another major problem with the Labovian framework for narrative analysis is that the Labovian categories do not have a place for parts of the narrative which are not uttered by the narrator. Furthermore, when the narrator responds to input from another speaker, such responses are also difficult to categorize. For example, in "Orégon" when Martine asks *y a des ours là-bas en Orégon?* in line c (assuming a modification of the representation of the narrative that will be described in more detail below), Betsy answers *ah oui* (line 8 of the interactive representation). However, giving such a line of speech autonomy within the narrative is problematic. According to the Labovian definitions, such a clause would be a free clause because it describes a state that is true for not only the entire duration of the narrative but universally. In other words, it should be able to appear anywhere in the narrative without changing the meaning. However, intuitively the response

to line c must be ordered after line c. In other words it is not free. In order to accommodate such interactive data as occurs in the Minnesota Corpus I propose the following modifications to the Labovian methodology. To allow for the fact that line c is free, but the response to line c is not, I have made the response to line c a part of the line which will be represented as C (I have decided to represent lines of non-narrator speech with CAPITAL letters). This convention allows for responses to be grouped together with those clauses which prompted them.

Another aspect of analysis that is hindered by a Labovian approach is how to order and categorize elements of a narrative while maintaining a focus on the perspectives of the speakers. For instance, with respect to repetition, something cannot be repeated until it has been said once, even if it refers to an event that has been going on for an extended period within the narrative. For example, in the Labovian representation of "Orégon" lines r and s are as follows:

r	c'est au jaquet
s	ah on joue au jaquet

But can s really come before r even though they both refer to the same thing? Line s is a continuation of the narrative following the confirmation of the name of the game that they played in r and so from an interactive perspective it would seem naïve to think that r

and s would be interchangeable as a Labovian analysis would suggest.

This issue also surfaces when a narrator repeats details of a narrative based on the audience's reaction. Again, consider the following clauses from "Orégon".

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| z  | mais moi je me dis mais qu'est-ce que c'est<br>imbécile il me dit « mes lunettes ! » maintenant il<br>est ceux qui vont nous attaquer ils savent qu'il<br>voit rien |
| Z  | (loud laughter)   |
| aa | non mais on était en pleine nuit  |
| bb | et puis en forêt dense  |

In the Labovian analysis lines aa and bb would be free clauses because they describe details of the setting which apply throughout the duration of the narrative. However, these clauses are clearly repeated in response to the loud laughter in line Z, which followed line z. Lines aa and bb seem to be uttered in order to put into focus the reason for the narrator's assertion in line z. Lines aa and bb may not have been uttered at all had it not been for the reaction in line Z. Given this sequence of events, it also seems naïve to suggest that lines aa and bb are really free. All of these instances of free clauses that are not really free because they constitute responses or repetitions are problematic because of Labov's insistence on determining the deep chronological structure of a narrative at the expense of the surface interactional structure

of a narrative. Labov is more concerned with deep structure or event structure rather than with the words as utterances which are anchored in an interactional sequence. This is an example of how Labov's methodology, while intended to handle conversational narrative, does so poorly because it is based on narratives that are not interactional at all.

### **3.3.2 Problems with the Notion of Event and Temporal Juncture**

Another of the problems with a Labovian approach to narrative analysis has to do with the simplification of the notions of both the narrative event and the defining narrative concept of temporal juncture. Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002) have outlined a definition of narrative that is dependent upon what Fleischman (1990:131) terms *iconic sequence*. Iconic sequence refers to the assumption that in narrative, the events narrated in the story world mirror actual events in the same order of their occurrence in the real world. For instance, Labov (1997) states that "there are no flashbacks in oral narratives of personal experience" (11). This foundation on iconic sequence is the reason that Labov places so much emphasis on the displacement sets of narrative clauses. These displacement sets must be defined in order for the iconic sequence to be understood. However, this one to one match between the chronology of events as they unfolded in the real world and the corresponding narrative



events does not always occur in identical order. In addition to the use of narrative techniques typically found in more the literary genres of narrative such as beginning a narrative *in medias res* and the use of devices such as flashbacks and flashforwards, all of which are typically used for aesthetic purposes and go against the narrative realization of the actual chronology, there are also inherent problems with the notion that such a one to one mapping of experience to narrative is even possible. That is to say that narratives never truly reflect reality as it was experienced by the narrator. The narrator chooses which events to portray and how to portray them so as to present his or her view of what happened, a view that is inherently skewed by the narrator's perspective. Fleischman (1990) suggests that narrative events are best viewed as a cognitive construct of the narrator. She states, "I believe some headway can be made if we approach the event as a cognitive construct that mediates between experience and language, yet belongs strictly to neither domain" (99). This concept is also described by Ong (1982):

Reality never occurs in narrative form. The totality of what happened to and in and around me since I got up this morning is not organized as narrative, and as a totality cannot be expressed as narrative. To make a narrative, I have to isolate certain elements out of the unbroken seamless web of history with a view to fitting them into a particular construct which I have more or less consciously in mind (12).

Therefore what a person narrates is not an exact replica of the reality that they experienced, but rather a representation of how what took place makes sense to the narrator given their beliefs and how they want to present themselves to their interlocutors. Thus, it follows that a definition based on the iconic sequence is quite naïve, given that the events and their sequence presented by the narrator are likely not a replica of what actually occurred.

Another problem with the Labovian approach to narrative analysis, which is an outgrowth of the difficulty of defining the event, stems from the insistence on the requirement of temporal juncture. Labov and Waletzky (1967) define a narrative as any sequence of clauses that contains at least one temporal juncture (i.e. contains at least two clauses that are temporally ordered with respect to one another). Labov and Waletzky (1967) explain:

A statement such as "I shot and killed him" would be a narrative, because it contains a temporal juncture, but not "I laughed and laughed at him." There are many ambiguous cases that allow two distinct interpretations: "I punched him in the head, the mouth and the chest" is normally a list, which does not imply that he was punched first in the head, then in the mouth, and then in the chest. But the temporal interpretation is possible, and it is more likely in "I beat him up and stomped on him"(28).

Narratives with just one instance of temporal juncture are referred to as minimal narratives. Temporal juncture is necessary according to Labov and Waletzky because they contend that one of the functions of narrative is to verbally recapitulate an experience.

They term this the referential function. The clauses in a narrative that provide temporal juncture are referred to as the complication and the resolution, or the sequential clauses. The complication is the series of events that makes up the main body of the narrative and the resolution is simply that which occurs after the complication and evaluation – that which resolves the narrative. For Labov and Waletzky these clauses represent events that must be strictly ordered in order to maintain an accurate account of what happened, in other words they are events that demonstrate temporal juncture.

There are, however, problems with a definition of narrative that relies strictly on the presence of temporal juncture. One problem is that an insistence on the necessity of temporal juncture leads to the exclusion of data that may be considered to be narrative data. Martin (1986) suggests that,

There is always a danger that our search for regularities of this sort will lead us to distort the evidence. This is of course the besetting flaw of most attempts to use scientific methods in the humanities and social sciences. The analyst sets out in search of a single form that will explain varied phenomena; having found one that, with a bit of stretching, will account for many examples, he either discards those that don't fit or says that there is some fault in the example, not in the explanation he has created; and thus instead of theories that explain what exists; we get theories -- imposed by critics -- in the form of "norms" from which the evidence deviates (93).

I suggest that the Labovian requirement of temporal juncture can be viewed as such a "norm" from which there is evidence that deviates. The requirement of temporal juncture necessitates the exclusion of narrative data that might otherwise be able to be analyzed. Other linguists have also pointed out the restrictiveness of the requirement of temporal juncture. Küntay and Ervin-Tripp (1997) also postulate that narratives do not require temporal juncture. A subsection of their data contain narratives that they term *rounds*, in which temporal juncture does not exist. Rounds are occasions in which certain elements of the background or context can be taken for granted. This would be the case, for example, if neighbors who had both experienced an earthquake were relaying to each other their individual experiences. In such a context, it would be unnecessary to start off the narrative with a statement such as "There was an earthquake . . .", as such information is understood because of the context. Therefore, an exchange could occur in which someone described what they did after an earthquake, where the fact that the earthquake took place is never mentioned and may not exist as the crucial second event necessary for the requirement of temporal juncture. To illustrate other types of narrative data that may be thought of as controversial, consider the text of "rouge et vert".

1        M:        et puis

2           et puis alors  
3           le le le grand patron de de mon mari  
4           la semaine de Noël  
5           il porte son costume de Noël  
6    M,C,E: rouge et vert!  
7    C:    [quelle horreur!]  
8    B,E:  [(laughter)]  
9    M:    oui oui  
10          c'est c'est incroyable  
11          on a été à des des parties  
12   ?:    (inaudible)  
13   M:    de de de Noël et  
14          euh  
15          il était fier  
16   C:    [oh c'est marrant ça]  
17   M:    [de son costume]  
18          il le sort chaque année!  
19   All:   (laughter)  
20   M:    mais c'est sa femme qui a dû l'choisir!  
21   All:   (laughter)  
22   C:    oh c'est marrant hein

1 M: and then  
2 and then so  
3 my my my husband's boss  
4 the week of Christmas  
5 he wears his Christmas suit  
6 M,C,E: red and green!  
7 C: [how awful!]  
8 B,E: [(laughter)]  
9 M: yes yes  
10 it's it's unbelievable  
11 we were at some some parties  
12 ?: (inaudible)  
13 M: for for for Christmas and  
14 euh  
15 he was proud  
16 C: [oh that's funny]  
17 M: [ of his suit ]  
18 he gets it out every year!  
19 All: (laughter)  
20 M: but it must be his wife who chose it!  
21 All: (laughter)  
22 C: oh that's funny isn't it

Although in the Labovian sense this excerpt would not be considered to be a narrative, I consider it to be one. While Martine is definitely narrating an event that occurred in the past, if we were to follow the strict definition of narrative as set forth by Labov and Waletzky (1967), this example may not be considered as one because rather than describing a series of events, this is really more a description of one event i.e. her husband's boss wears a red and green suit at Christmastime. There is no temporal juncture and yet this sequence is a narrative. It clearly is a verbal recapitulation of an experience/event in the past, an event that is heavily evaluated. Therefore although the narrative lacks temporal juncture it fulfills both the referential and evaluative functions of narrative. Literary critic Thomas Leitch proposes that chronology and causality are not essential to narrative:

The constitutive feature of narrative development is the sequence of the audience's perceptions, projections, and reintegrations of the story, typically following a line of development from illusion to disillusionment, and for this purpose plot in the sense of a temporal or causal sequence of events is clearly not necessary . . . Story is possible without plot (130).

Given that both the referential and evaluative functions of narrative are met in "rouge et vert", I consider it to be a narrative. The fact that such texts cannot be considered in a Labovian framework constitutes a deficit of the framework.

In order to further illustrate the problem with the notion of temporal juncture, consider the text of "l'histoire-géographie, Christine" (what follows is the Labovian representation of "histoire-géographie, Christine"; for the interactive representation, see Appendix 6).

- a                    moi je me souviens on avait j'avais déc- on avait  
décidé moi et une copine de réviser tu vois bien
- A                    c'est ça oui
- b                    l'histoire-géographie surtout parce qu'on était  
nulle et alors et on avait
- B                    c'était le pire l'his[toire-géographie]
- B                    [ah non ! J'ai eu une excellente  
note]
- B                    ah oui mais toi t'es historienne !
- B                    oui c'est ça ! c'est pour ça que j'adorais ça !
- B                    l'histoire mon Dieu ! mon Dieu ! [c'est oh là là]
- c                    [et on avait]  
attends ! on avait décidé avec ma copine de de  
réviser
- d                    mais bien travailler parce que quoi crotte alors  
hein !
- D                    [c'est vrai !]
- e                    [alors on] on allait au lycée toutes les deux tu  
vois



f de plus on (inaudible) on se donnait rendez-vous  
au lycée

g et puis on regardait les mecs (loud laughter)

G (laughter)

G on dit (inaudible)

h on était là ouais

i et puis après on se regardait toutes les deux

j on dit merde on est quand même venu pour  
travailler (uttered quickly and with laughter)

j (loud laughter)

k on repartait on repartait chez moi toutes les  
deux (uttered quickly and with laughter)

l on se faisait du pain perdu (uttered quickly and  
with laughter)

L (laughter/more like a chuckle)

m je crois que j'ai eu 6

M (laughter)

n j'avais pas du tout (inaudible) oh là là

  

a I remember we had I had dec- we had decided  
me and a friend to review so you see

A that's it yes

b history-geography above all because we were  
worthless and so and we had

B history-geography [ was the worst  
 ]  
 B [ah no! I got an excellent  
 grade]  
 B ah yes but you are a historian!  
 B yes that's it! that's why I adored it!  
 B history my God! my God! [it's oh là là]  
 c [and we had] wait! We  
 had decided with my friend to to review  
 d but to really work because well crap right!  
 D [it's true!]  
 e [so we] the two of us went to school you see  
 f and what's more we (inaudible) we set a meeting  
 at school  
 g and then we looked at guys (loud laughter)  
 G (laughter)  
 G we say (inaudible)  
 h we were there yeah  
 i and then after we looked at each other  
 j we say shit we did still come here to work  
 (uttered quickly and with laughter)  
 j (loud laughter)  
 k we left we left for my house both of us (uttered  
 quickly and with laughter)

l	we made French toast (uttered quickly and with laughter)
L	(laughter/more like a chuckle)
m	I think I got a 6
M	(laughter)
n	I didn't at all (inaudible) oh là là

Even more so than the interaction concerning the horrific Christmas suit belonging to Martine's husband's boss, this interaction about Christine's experience studying for her histoire-géographie exam clearly recapitulates a series of events in the past, events that are heavily evaluated. Thus the referential and evaluative functions of narrative are met. However, if the constraint that all narrative clauses must be discrete sequential events is maintained, then this text, too, would not be considered a narrative. In a Labovian analysis only the clause in line m *j'ai eu 6* (I got a 6) would constitute the type of discrete event of which there must be two in order for a text to be considered a narrative. Perhaps the clauses in lines a and c (*on avait décidé moi et une copine de réviser; on avait décider avec ma copine de réviser*) could qualify as they clearly must have occurred prior to the event in clause m (*j'ai eu 6*), however these clauses can also be considered to be part of the orientation. In any event this is clearly an example of the kind of controversial narrative data that is not

easily accommodated within the Labovian methodology. To further illustrate why I believe that this text should be viewed as a narrative, consider the following clauses.

- e        alors on on allait au lycée toutes les deux
- f        de plus on (inaudible) on se donnait rendez-vous au lycée
- g        et puis on regardait les mecs
- i        et puis après on se regardait toutes les deux
- j        on dit "merde on est quand même venu pour travailler"
- k        on repartait on repartait chez moi toutes les deux
- l        on se faisait du pain perdu

These clauses are all delivered in the imparfait, except for clause j which is in the present though is linked semantically with clause i. However, these clauses could be interpreted as having occurred as discrete events. It hardly seems logical for Christine and her friend to have left for her house and made French toast without first having had their failed attempt to study at school. Such a scenario is implied as a possibility if these clauses are labeled as orientation clauses. So, either the interaction is not a narrative or the concept of temporal juncture is flawed. I propose that the latter is true. Another possible interpretation for this text is that this is a series of events that occurred on more than one

occasion. It seems quite arbitrary to me that if you tell someone about something that happened once that it should be considered to be a narrative but that if the same person did the same thing twice and then told someone about it that that should not be considered to be a narrative. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to view temporal juncture as a feature of a prototypical narrative, but one that does not always occur in a narrative.

### **3.3.3 Problems with the Labovian Notion of Evaluation**

It also seems apparent that the Labovian notion of evaluation could use some refining. First of all, there is the issue that not all evaluative devices are used to heighten drama as suggested within the Labovian framework. But even more than that, the very notion of evaluation as a definable component of narrative is difficult to maintain when no mention of audience reaction is made. Given what we have discussed in section 3.3.2 about the fact that every narrative element, including the events making up the complicating action, emanates through the subjective filter of the narrator's perspective, it would seem as if everything contained in a narrative would to some degree constitute evaluation. The case can also be made, however, that the notion of evaluation is too broad to be useful. If we enumerate the evaluative devices suggested by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972), the list is quite diverse and long: direct statements,

lexical intensifiers, suspension of the action through coordinate clauses, restricted clauses, and repetition, symbolic actions, judgements of a third person, gestures, expressive phonology, quantifiers, ritual utterances, negatives, futures, modals, questions, imperatives, comparatives, progressives, appended participles, double appositives, double attributives, left-hand participles and explicatives. Given this list, there are already many elements to look for in a narrative in order to arrive at the evaluative component of that narrative. However, additionally, Labov and Waletzky state that "the fundamental definition of evaluation must be semantic" (37). With this definition they open up the possibility for a much broader interpretation of what constitutes evaluation as has been suggested here and by others (Culler, 1981; Ochs, 1986; Blyth, 1990). For instance, a narrator will only include those events that lead to their version of what happened. However, there are almost certainly always more events that occurred than are presented. In this way, even the events of a narrative are part of the evaluation because they provide the information necessary to answer the question of why the narrative is important. Let's take "Orégon" as an example. Maybe there was a wind that night and there were branches that had been blowing around or perhaps some of Martine and her husband's camping supplies were blown around. If these events did occur, including

them in the narration would weaken the case Martine was making about the danger that they perceived themselves to be in. Thus, the inclusion of some events and the omission of others are subjective decisions made by the narrator to get his or her version of events across. In this sense, events are part of the evaluation. If we accept a broader definition of evaluation it is not long before it is realized that it can be extended to include all narrative elements thereby potentially rendering it useless as a construct. If this is the case, then trying to define evaluation becomes problematic.

Assuming for the time being that the notion of evaluation is valuable, it is important to note that not all evaluative devices lead to either heightened interest or increased drama within a narrative. Ochs (1986) suggests that conveying a stance which does not heighten the drama of an event does not translate into a lack of evaluation. She states that,

All sentences expressed in context will have an affective component. In certain contexts, the affect conveyed will be one of 'distance' from some proposition conveyed. Thus a speaker or writer may convey an impersonal attitude or indifference or objectivity in expressing information. As noted, such an affect may be a registral defying feature. Indeed, much of current scientific communication is consumed with the idea that objectivity is an ideal disposition and means a formal style. It would be naïve to see this disposition as an absence of affect (256-257).

Blyth (1990:9-10) also asserts a broader view of evaluation than what Labov set forth. He suggests that evaluation is present in all linguistic phenomena and that the Labovian representation of clauses that lack evaluation is misleading. What Blyth contends is that these supposed non-evaluative clauses are really attempts by the speaker to project a stance of distance and objectivity, thus creating a sense of events that are more ordinary or generic in nature. Therefore Blyth claims that a comprehensive view of evaluation should include both the use of the Labovian defined devices as well as their non-use. Thus, a complete definition of evaluation would include more than just the types of devices that are enumerated by Labov. Following Blyth, I propose that evaluative devices can be divided into two categories: *drama-creating evaluation* and *distance-creating evaluation*. Both types of evaluation can lead to success depending on both the goals and the context of a conversation. Sometimes the goal of a conversational participant may be to establish social distance between himself/herself and the co-participants. In other instances, a speaker may wish to downplay the drama in their narrative so as not to call into question its truthfulness, in other words, in order not to be accused of exaggeration. In such contexts, distance-creating evaluation, not the drama-creating type



espoused by Labov will allow the narrator to achieve their interactional goal.

However, even more important than the omission by Labov of distance-creating evaluation from his methodology is how he ignores the important effects of the audience members on evaluation and how it should be understood. Recall the following quote from Labov and Waletzky:

When the subject is asked if he were ever in serious danger of being killed, and he says "Yes," then he is asked: "What happened?". He finds himself in a position in which he must demonstrate to the listener that he really was in danger. The more vivid and real the danger appears, the more effective the narrative. If the narrative is weak and uninteresting, he will have made a false claim (34).

Here Labov and Waletzky indicate that a narrator must use evaluation to make their narrative appear more vivid and real. Implied in this suggestion is that it must appear this way to the audience to whom the narrative is being told. I term this the *so what factor* because of Labov and Waletzky's suggestion that the use of evaluation is necessary to ward off the dreaded audience question "So what?" And yet, never is such audience reaction discussed within the Labovian methodology. This issue resurfaces in Labov's more recent writings on reportability. Recall also Labov's characterization that when a person tells a narrative, it is usually done so in order to describe the most reportable event, defined as "an event that is the least common and has the largest

consequences for the welfare and well-being of the participants" (2002:10). Here again Labov references the centrality of the role of the audience members and how they react to a narrative and yet such reaction does not find a place in Labov's methodology. On this matter Labov suggests that because there can exist no absolute standard of inherent interest because what is interesting to an audience is highly context dependent, that it does not warrant analysis. Labov states: "Given the difficulty of measuring the interest of the narrative or the competing claims, this approach to reportability itself is of limited interest. Yet the concept of "the most reportable event" is central to the organizational structure of the narrative" (1997:7). Labov is quite correct that this issue determining reportability is central to understanding narrative. However, I strongly disagree that it is of limited interest. How to operationalize audience reaction must be explored. In this way what events are truly reportable can be determined.

With this goal in mind I will attempt to evaluate Labov's concept of evaluation through the analysis of audience reaction. Sometimes a narrator's goals are not shared by the co-participants. In such a case, the audience to the narrative may not appreciate the evaluation used by the narrator and therefore show their disapproval through lack of positive feedback or more forcefully with negative feedback. This situation occurs in the

narrative "Nîmes" in the Minnesota corpus (see Appendix 10 for the full text of the narrative). In "Nîmes" Martine narrates about a friend who knocks over a market display in the streets of Nîmes because of his objection to the use of animals for profit. In her narration of the events, Martine displays her attitude toward the events in the story in two ways. First she contends that she did not believe that her friend would actually go through with his plan as is evident in the evaluation in lines 28 and 39.

28 M: alors je me suis dit il va jamais le faire

39 M: je dis "il va pas le faire"

28 M: so I said to myself he's never going to do it

39 M: I'm saying "he's not going to do it"

After revealing that the friend did in fact do what Martine thought he would not, the other conversational co-participants voice their disagreement with the evaluation suggested by Martine. They contend that rather than lingering in disbelief as Martine states that she did, that Martine should have done something different. This is evident by the responses in lines 67 and 68.

67 C: tu aurais pu l'arrêter!

68 E: moi je l'aurais dit "écoutes t'as"

67 C: you should have been able to stop him

68 E: I would have said to him "listen you have"

Then, Martine proceeds to provide an alternative way to view the situation once her initial feelings of disbelief proved to be inaccurate. In lines 69-70 and 72-73 Martine evaluates the situation as being one of humor.

69 M: moi je trouvais ça marrant

70 ça m'était jamais arrivé

72 M: ça m'était jamais arrivé

73 (laughter)

69 M: I thought it was funny

70 that had never happened to me

72 M: that had never happened to me

73 (laughter)

When faced with this revised view of the narrated events, Christine and Evelyne further express their disapproval of how Martine has evaluated the situation. Rather than providing positive feedback, they provide negative feedback and then abruptly change the subject in lines 74 and 82-85.

74 E: (pause) (voiced sigh)

82 C: c'est quand même bête ça

83 E: Betsy est-ce que tu nous fais une

84 une vinaigrette

85                est-ce que tu utilises la vinaigrette?

74    E:    (pause) (voiced sigh)

82    C:    that is nevertheless dumb

83    E:    Betsy did you make us this

84                vinaigrette

85                do you use a vinaigrette?

The preceeding example is a perfect illustration of why the Labovian methodology for analyzing the evaluative component of a narrative without including audience contribution is inadequate. If only Martine's contribution is analyzed then the level of evaluation may seem to be adequate. I maintain, however, that it is only through looking at the input of the audience members that the *so what factor* can truly be discovered. In "Nîmes" the audience does not say "So what?", but they also clearly do not agree with how Martine has evaluated the narrative. Therefore, while the narrative has abundant evaluation, the narrator has not succeeded in convincing her interlocutors to adopt her point of view. Therefore, I suggest that such contributions by audience members must always be considered. This idea will be explored in more detail in chapter four.

### **3.4 CONCLUSION**

In this chapter I have provided an explication of the Labovian methodology for narrative analysis as detailed in Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002). Additionally, I point out some of the weaknesses of the methodology. This framework for narrative analysis was developed to deal with elicited narrative data collected within the context of the sociolinguistic interview. While the goal of these elicitations was to simulate conversational narrative, the data studied within the Labovian framework had little to no interaction. Therefore, the framework does not provide a way to deal with such interaction in actual conversational narratives and constitutes a major weakness of the framework. The Labovian framework also relies upon the sequencing of events and the notion of temporal juncture as keys to the definition of narrative. I have argued that the Labovian notion of event is problematic because of the subjectivity of the event. It has also been suggested that adhering to the requirement of temporal juncture does not allow for the inclusion of more controversial sources of narrative data. Finally, the Labovian notion of evaluation is challenged. As it is defined by Labov and Waletzky and Labov, what is included as evaluative is too narrow, focusing only on devices which enhance the drama of the events narrated. I suggest a broader definition of evaluation than that

proposed by Labov. This definition must also include reference to the contributions of the audience members of a narrative. This is the only way to ensure that the narrator and the audience are arriving at mutual agreement. Such inclusion of audience participation is necessary so that the *so what factor* can be analyzed.

## **Chapter 4: Polanyi (1985)**

### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

Now that the Labovian methodology for narrative analysis has been summarized and critiqued, it is possible to show how Polanyi built upon Labov's work in order to analyze conversational narratives. Polanyi's 1985 book *Telling the American Story* recognizes the contribution of the work of Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972) but also builds upon it in a very important way by recognizing the interactivity of conversational narratives. To allow for such interaction, Polanyi created a category of narrative clauses that she labeled Non-Storyworld Clauses. Polanyi's main goal, however, is to arrive at a synopsis of a narrative through an analysis of that narrative's evaluation. Thus, while Polanyi does not provide an analysis of the Non-Storyworld Clauses contained within narratives, I feel as though this is an aspect of her methodology that can be expanded upon and improved. Therefore, this chapter's focus will be an expanded discussion of these Non-Storyworld Clauses and what they can tell us about the interactive element of narrative.

### **4.2 POLANYIAN METHODOLOGY: POLANYI (1985)**

Polanyi (1985) proposed her own methodology for analyzing narrative that built upon the ideas of Labov and Waletzky (1967)



and Labov (1972). Polanyi's approach is also a structural approach that seeks to isolate and define the components of a narrative. A major contribution made by Polanyi was that her framework allowed for the analysis of not only elicited narratives but also of conversational narratives.

For Polanyi, narratives are made up of Main Line Story Event Clauses, Durative-Descriptive Clauses, and Non-Storyworld Clauses. The Main Line Story Event Clauses are defined by Polanyi as follows:

A series of successive instants in the narrated world which correspond to the moving reference point in the narrative construction of that world . . . *Event clauses* are semantically *noniterative, non-habitual* and *temporarily bounded* (16-17).

Polanyi's Mainline Story Event Clauses correspond to the complication and resolution as set forth by Labov and Waletzky, or to Labov's later sequential clauses. Polanyi's Durative-Descriptive Clauses include such things as descriptions of characters, settings, and motivations, along with habitual, iterative, or noninstantaneous actions and events which are semantically interpreted to be off the main time line (20). These correspond to Labov and Waletzky's orientation clauses.

Polanyi also creates a new category of clause, the Non-Storyworld Clause. Into this category go all clauses that are not directly a part of the storyworld. The addition of this category was necessary because Polanyi was analyzing conversational

narratives. Conversational narratives include many such clauses, particularly any comments made by other participants in the conversation but also those clauses uttered by the narrator that are not specifically related to the narrative. Labov and Waletzky's narratives were elicited and therefore contained little to no interaction and so anything outside of the storyworld is simply not treated in their framework.

Like Labov and Waletzky, Polanyi also stresses the importance of evaluation in a narrative. In fact, for Polanyi there is a distinction between a narrative and what she simply terms a story. In order for a narrative to qualify as a story it must have evaluation (16). Polanyi also stresses the interactive importance of evaluation by emphasizing how evaluation is used by the audience members to interpret the narrative from the narrator's perspective: "Evaluation allows the story recipients to build up a model of the relevant information in the text which matches the teller's intentions as signalled by the manner in which the information about the storyworld is communicated" (21). Polanyi defines evaluation in the following way: "*evaluation* . . . is accomplished by encoding the information to be accorded increased weight in a way which departs from the local norm of the text" (22). Polanyi maintains that evaluation is accomplished through the use of various evaluative devices, but that there are no fixed devices. By

this she means that "any device available for evaluation can be used nonevaluatively as well or can be so over-used that it becomes a textual norm" (22). These devices include phonological phenomena, syntactic features, and discourse level strategies.

Polanyi describes evaluative devices as including the following:

Phonologically, a speaker may pronounce a word in a distinctive way, accentuate an odd syllable, or use a distinctive dialectal sound quality. Changes in stress and volume are also available to mark prominence as well as onomatopoeia, rhyme, and nonlinguistic noises. Lexically, a speaker may choose a word from a different register from the text norm -- perhaps using a colloquial word in a formal text or vice-versa; "loaded" words may be used and words rich in connotation. Profanity, foreign words and precise use of relatively infrequent words also can be used to draw attention to the proposition so encoded.

Syntactically . . . a multitude of resources are available, including modification, the use of comparators, superlatives, and negative sentences . . . . Modal operators and adverbials which shift the point of view from one frame of reference to another can also be evaluative, as can other types of elaboration and specification phenomena which highlight some aspect of the discourse world by giving a good deal of information about it. Any marked change in syntactic complexity calls attention to itself . . . . In stories, the first event after a string of durative-descriptive clauses demands special attention . . . .

At the discourse level, a wide variety of devices are available; repetition, reported speech or thought, flashbacks or flashaheads which delay the action, and explicit meta-comments as well as "clustering" a number of events at the "peak" of the story (22-23).

Polanyi also distinguishes between two types of evaluation: contential evaluation and deictic evaluation. Contential evaluation

consists of an evaluating device that is evaluating the clause in which the device is located. For instance in clause 84 from "Orégon", the use of onomatopoeia constitutes contential evaluation because it evaluates the information it presents by presenting it in an unusual format.

84 (makes sound of footsteps)

Deictic evaluation consists of evaluation of information contained in one clause by devices that occur in other clauses. Polanyi describes deictic evaluation in the following way:

Along with comments about the story, there are a number of other commonly used deictic devices including elaboration in later clauses on information presented earlier, generalization from one instance to the general case, flash sequences which give explanatory information, and, often, reported speech. . . . Repetition is the purest deictic device -- what is evaluated achieves prominence by the mere fact of repetition (24-25).

It should be noted, however, that these two categories for evaluation are not mutually exclusive. A clause can contain both contential and deictic evaluation. For instance in clause 54 from "Orégon", the word imbécile (imbecile) constitutes contential evaluation of a lexical nature, while Martine's statement also refers to the exclamation made by Bill in clauses 52 and 56, thus rendering it an example of deictic evaluation as well.

58 M: mais moi je me dis mais qu'est-ce que c'est  
imbécile

58 M: but I say to myself how stupid

Polanyi suggests that by analyzing the linguistic structure of a narrative, one can determine which elements in a given narrative were most relevant to the narrator. To this end the entire Polanyian methodology is geared toward the creation of what she terms the Adequate Paraphrase of a narrative. Polanyi states:

it is possible to construct a paraphrase of the telling, an *Adequate Paraphrase*, using only the most heavily evaluated main line story events (*key events*) and the most heavily evaluated durative descriptive information (*crucial contextualizing information* or *CCI*). The Adequate Paraphrase, composed entirely of the elements singled out by the teller for special emphasis, eliminates all incidental propositions (26).

To illustrate the methodology for narrative analysis as suggested by Polanyi, I will use the narrative "Orégon" from the Minnesota corpus. I have chosen this narrative because it contains significant interaction from the conversational co-participants and thus allows us to see how such material is treated within the Polanyian approach. What follows is an excerpt of "Orégon" that will be quoted throughout this chapter for illustrative purposes. The narrative and the complete analysis can be found in Appendix 2.

**Excerpt from "Orégon", Interactive Representation**

- 1 M.: oui oui bien sûr euh
- 2 c'était un voyage dans l'ouest
- 3 et on était dans euh

4 je crois que c'était l'Orégon  
 5 y a des ours  
 6 là-bas  
 7 en Orégon?  
 8 B.: oh oui  
 9 M.: oui c'est ça c'était l'Orégon!  
 10 et euh  
 11 on faisait du camping  
 12 et sur toutes les tables  
 13 il y avait écrit euh  
 14 "éloignez la nourriture mettez-la dans la voiture  
 et la voiture  
 15 loin de la tente des ours les ours attaquent!"  
 16 B.,C.: [ (laughter) ]  
 17 [c'est sympathique hein!]  
 18 M: [on était on était ]  
 19 dans un trou  
 20 y avait des des des de des genres de de  
 montagne tout autour  
 21 et alors  
 22 ça attaque

**"Oregon", Interactive Representation, translation**

1 M.: yes yes of course uh  
2 it was a trip west  
3 and we were in uh  
4 I think that it was Oregon  
5 are there bears  
6 there  
7 in Oregon?  
8 B.: oh yes  
9 M.: yes that's it it was Oregon!  
10 and uh  
11 we were camping  
12 and on all the tables  
13 it was written uh  
14 "keep food away put it in the car and the car  
15 far from the tent bears bears attack!"  
16 B.,C.: [ (laughter) ]  
17 [ oh that's nice! ]  
18 M: [we were we were]  
19 in a valley  
20 there were some some some some some  
mountains all around  
21 and so  
22 they attack

Polanyi states that the first step in the creation of the Adequate Paraphrase is to divide the narrative into individual clauses or independent utterances. The difficulty of this important step is discussed by Polanyi:

Under the rubric "independent utterances" are included minimal responses, such as "yes" and "no," "well," "but," "so", and other discourse particles; as well as "you," "man," and other parentheticals; exclamations; and unfinished phrases which surface in texts in hesitations, repetitions, false starts, and other phenomena. This assorted linguistic material has in common with fully formed main and subordinate clauses and nonclausal "complete thoughts" its unitary nature. While in an ideal text the chunking might well be into clauses because clauses may encode full propositions, all of the other structures which occur in a real text must be accommodated as well (27).

Polanyi's treatment of such information marks a departure from Labov and Waletzky's approach to dividing a narrative into clauses. Here is what the division of clauses looks like for the excerpt from "Orégon".

**Division of "Orégon" into independent clauses**

- 1      oui oui bien sûr euh
- 2      c'était un voyage dans l'ouest
- 3      et on était dans
- 4      euh
- 5      je crois
- 6      que c'était l'Orégon



7 y a des ours là-bas en Orégon?  
8 oh oui  
9 oui  
10 c'est ça  
11 c'était l'Orégon!  
12 et euh  
13 on faisait du camping  
14 et sur toutes les tables il y avait écrit  
15 euh  
16 "éloignez la nourriture  
17 mettez-la dans la voiture et la voiture loin de la tente  
18 des ours  
19 les ours attaquent!"  
20 (laughter)  
21 c'est sympathique  
22 hein!  
23 on était  
24 on était dans un trou  
25 y avait des  
26 des  
27 des  
28 de

29 des genres de  
30 de montagne tout autour  
31 et alors  
32 ça attaque

**Division of "Orégon" into independent clauses (translation)**

1 yes yes of course uh  
2 it was a trip west  
3 and we were in  
4 uh  
5 I think  
6 that it was Oregon  
7 are there bears there in Oregon?  
8 oh yes  
9 yes  
10 that's it  
11 it was Oregon!  
12 and uh  
13 we were camping  
14 and on all the tables it was written  
15 uh  
16 "keep food away

17 put it in the car and the car far from the tent  
18 bears  
19 bears attack!"  
20 laughter  
21 that's nice  
22 huh!  
23 we were  
24 we were in a valley  
25 there were some  
26 some  
27 some  
28 some  
29 some sort of  
30 mountains all around  
31 and so  
32 they attack

Notice for instance that in Polanyi's division into independent clauses each verb must be represented in its own independent clause. So line 4 in the Interactive Representation

4 je crois que c'était l'Orégon

4 I think that it was Oregon

must become two independent clauses in Polanyi's methodology.

5 je crois

6 que c'était l'Orégon

5 I think

6 that it was Oregon

Another major difference that is notable in this excerpt is that false starts are independent clauses in Polanyi's methodology. Thus, line 20 in the Interactive Representation

20 y avait des des des de des genres de de montagne tout  
autour

20 there were some some some some some sort of of mountains  
all around

becomes six independent clauses in Polanyi's methodology.

25 y avait des

26 des

27 des

28 de

29 des genres de

30 de montagne tout autour

25 there were some

26 some

- 27     some
- 28     some
- 29     some sort of
- 30     of mountains all around

The next step in the creation of the Adequate Paraphrase is to separate the list of independent clauses into separate lists of Main Line Story Event Clauses, Durative-Descriptive Clauses, and Non-Storyworld Clauses. What follows are the corresponding lists of clauses from "Orégon". Note that in Polanyi's methodology, reported speech is handled such that the verb of saying constitutes an event (and is italicized), while what is said does not and is considered to be durative-descriptive..

#### **Main Line Story Event Clauses**

- 34            on s'en va le lendemain
- 40            on plante la tente
- 61            tout d'un coup contre la tente y a quelque chose là
- 65/66        qui qui frôle la tente
- 69            *Bill il fait* "who's out there?"
- 73            *il me dit* "Martine! mes lunettes!"
- 80            *il dit* "Martine mes lunettes!"
- 84            *mais moi je me dis* "mais qu'est-ce que c'est imbécile il me dit 'mes lunettes!' maintenant il

	est ceux qui vont nous attaquer ils savent qu'il voit rien"
96	<i>et il me dit "mes lunettes!"</i>
106	<i>parce que j'ai dit "ça y est là on va nous tomber dessus"</i>
113	je trouve ses lunettes
117/118	après après il est sorti avec la lampe
119	et il est cherché
120	rien
122/124	au bout d'un moment on a fini le jeu
126-128	on on on se couche donc
131-133	quand on entend (makes the sound of footsteps) dans les feuilles de la forêt
140	on est sorti
141	on a plié la tente
142	on a passé la nuit dans la voiture
144	on est parti à deux heures

**"Orégon", Durative-Descriptive Clauses** (for a complete list of the Durative-Descriptive clauses, see Appendix 2)

2	c'était un voyage dans l'ouest
3	et on était dans
6	que c'était l'Orégon
11	c'était l'Orégon!
13	on faisait du camping

14	et sur toutes les tables il y avait écrit
16	"éloignez la nourriture
17	mettez-la dans la voiture et la voiture loin de la tente
18/19	des ours les ours attaquent!"
23/24	on était on était dans un trou
25-30	y avait des des des de des genres de de montagnes tout autour
32	ça attaque

**"Orégon", Non-Storyworld Clauses** (for a complete list of the Non-Storyworld clauses, see Appendix 2)

1	oui oui bien sûr euh
4	euh
5	je crois
7	y a des ours là-bas en Orégon?
8	oh oui
9	oui
10	c'est ça
12	et euh
15	euh
20	(laughter)
21	c'est sympathique
22	hein!
31	et alors

Once the clauses have been divided into their respective categories, the third step in the creation of the Adequate Paraphrase is to prepare lists of the propositions that correspond to the Mainline Story clauses and the Durative-Descriptive clauses. Polanyi describes the process by which clauses are transformed into propositions:

The propositions are listed in the order in which they occur in the source text. The temporal ordering of the source text is thus preserved. In the case of reported speech, what was said is represented as subordinate to a matrix verb of saying. If the reported speech is direct discourse, the verb of the matrix clause is an event, while what is said is not. Full references are substituted for anaphoric or deictic expressions and, as far as possible, the clause is normalized into an affirmative statement with the scopes of negatives and other modals relatively clear (28).

What follows are the lists of Mainline Story Event and Durative-Descriptive propositions that correspond to their respective lists of clauses for the "Orégon" narrative.

**"Orégon", Main Line Story Event Propositions**

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| 34       | The narrator and her husband left the next day.  |
| 40       | The narrator and her husband pitched the tent.   |
| 61/65/66 | All of a sudden there was something there which was brushing against the tent.                         |
| 69       | <i>The husband said "who's out there?"</i>   |
| 73/80/96 | <i>The husband said "Martine! my glasses!"</i>   |
| 84       | <i>The narrator said to herself "But why is this imbecile saying to me 'my glasses!' now the thing</i> |



	that is going to attack us doesn't know that he can't see anything".
106	<i>The narrator said_</i> "This is it, it's going to come down on us".
113	The narrator finds her husband's glasses.
117/118	The husband leaves with the lantern.
119	The husband looks.
120	The husband doesn't find anything.
122/124	The narrator and her husband finish their game.
126-128	The narrator and her husband go to sleep.
131-133	The narrator and her husband hear the sound of footsteps in the leaves of the forest.
140	The narrator and her husband left.
141	The narrator and her husband folded the tent.
142	The narrator and her husband spent the night in the car.
144	The narrator and her husband left at two o'clock.

**"Orégon", Durative-Descriptive Clauses**

2	The narrator and her husband were on a trip west.
3/6/11	The narrator and her husband were in Oregon.
13	The narrator and her husband were camping.

14/16-19	It was written on all of the tables "Keep food away. Put it in the car. Put the car far away from the tent. Bears attack".
23/24	The narrator and her husband were in a valley
25-30	Some sort of mountains were all around.
32	Bears attack.
35	The narrator and her husband never stayed more than one day in the same place.
36	The narrator and her husband were on a trip.
38	The scenery was truly remarkable.
42-46/51-52	The narrator and her husband are playing backgammon by the light of the lantern.
59	The narrator and her husband are playing jacquet
62	Something passes by quickly.
70	"Who's out there?" is said by the husband.
74/81/97	"Martine! my glasses!" is said by the husband.
85-91	<i>But why is this imbecile saying to me 'my glasses!' now the thing that is going to attack us doesn't know that he can't see anything</i> is said by the narrator to herself.
95	The narrator and her husband were in the middle of the night in a dense forest.
100	Something had brushed up against the tent.
102	The narrator was paralyzed.
103-104	The narrator was reacting.

107	<i>This is it</i> was said by the narrator.
108	<i>It's going to come down on us</i> is said by the narrator.
110	<i>It's the end</i> is said by the narrator.
134/136	Something was coming toward us.
137	That something was clearly footsteps.
146	The narrator and her husband didn't see anything.
147	The narrator and her husband saw a little something like a big mouse.

Storyworld clauses must also be examined for deictic reference to information within the storyworld. This information is compiled into a chart. An excerpt of such a chart for "Orégon" is illustrated in Table 1. The full chart appears in Appendix 2.

Table 1

<b>Clause Number</b>	<b>Clause</b>	<b>Story Event (E), Durative-Descriptive (D), or Non-Storyworld (n.s.)</b>	<b>Proposition + Contential Evaluators</b>	<b>Proposition + Deictic Evaluators</b>	<b>Other Clauses Evaluated by this Clause</b>
1	oui oui bien sûr euh	n.s.			
2	c'était un voyage dans l'ouest	D		Specification, clauses 3, 5-6, 11	
3	et on était dans	D		Specification, clauses 5-6, 11	
4	euh	n.s.			
5	je crois	n.s.		Specification, clause 6	External Comment, clause 6
6	que c'était l'Orégon	D			
7	y a des ours là- bas en Orégon?	n.s.		Repetition of Orégon, clause 6	External Demand, clauses 3- 6
8	oh oui	n.s.			External Agreement

					, clause 7
9	oui	n.s.		Repetition of oui, clause 8	External Agreement, clauses 6-8
10	c'est ça	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 6, 8-9
11	c'était l'Orégon!	D		Repetition of Orégon, clauses 6-7	External Affirmation, clauses 5-6
12	et euh	n.s.			
13	on faisait du camping	D			
14	et sur toutes les tables il y avait écrit	D			Refers to clauses 16-18, 32
15	euh	n.s.			
16	"éloignez la nourriture	D	Indication of danger		Refers to clauses 14, 17-18, 32
17	mettez-la dans la voiture et la voiture loin de la tente	D	Indication of danger		Refers to clauses 14, 16, 18, 32
18	des ours	D	Indication of danger	Repetition of ours, clause 7	Refers to clauses 14, 16-17, 32
19	les ours attaquent!"	D	Indication of danger	Repetition of ours, clauses 7, 18	Refers to clauses, 14, 16-18, 32
20	laughter	n.s.			External

					Exclamation, clauses 14, 16-19
21	c'est sympathique	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 14, 16-19
22	hein!	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 14, 16-19, 21
23	on était	D			
24	on était dans un trou	D	Volume and pitch increase on trou	Repetition of on était, clause 23; Specification, clauses 25-30	
25	y avait des	D			More Detail, clause 24
26	des	D		Repetition of des, clause 25	More Detail, clause 24
27	des	D		Repetition of des, clauses 25-26	More Detail, clause 24
28	de	D			More Detail, clause 24
29	des gens de	D		Repetition of des, clauses 25-27	More Detail, clause 24
30	de montagne tout autour	D		Repetition of de, clause 29	More Detail, clause 24
31	et alors	n.s.			
32	ça attaque	D	Indication of danger	Repetition of attaque,	Refers to clauses 14,

				clause 19; ça refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19	16-19
--	--	--	--	--	-------

Once the information in the chart has been compiled, the rough amount of evaluation accorded to each storyworld proposition can be determined. This process constitutes the fifth step in creating the Adequate Paraphrase. While Polanyi does not describe this process in detail, I have performed it as follows. I have given one point to each clause for each time it is referred to deictically by another clause, one point for the utterance of the clause itself and one point for each instance of contential evaluation contained within a clause. For a listing of the clauses which received eight or more points, see Appendix 2. Here are the most heavily evaluated Mainline Story Event and Durative-Descriptive propositions from "Orégon"<sup>1</sup>.

3/6/11      The narrator and her husband were in Oregon.

14/16-19    It was written on all of the tables "Keep food away. Put it in the car. Put the car far away from the tent. Bears attack".

---

<sup>1</sup> Included in the list of most heavily evaluated propositions are propositions featuring clauses that contained eight or more points of evaluation with the following exceptions. Clauses 3, 11, 65, 85, 91, 96, and 97 were included even though they did not have eight or more points because they complete ideas contained in clauses that did have eight or more points. Clauses 7, 24, 42, 45, 47, 150, and 153 were not included even though they did contain eight or more points either because they were Non-Storyworld clauses or because they had only eight or nine points and would require the inclusion of even more marginal clauses to allow for the inclusion of a complete idea.

32	Bears attack.
61/65/66	All of a sudden there was something there which was brushing against the tent.
62	Something passes by quickly.
69	<i>The husband said "who's out there?"</i>
70	<i>"Who's out there?"</i> is said by the husband.
73/80/96	<i>The husband said "Martine! my glasses!"</i>
74/81/97	<i>"Martine! my glasses!"</i> is said by the husband.
85-91	<i>But why is this imbecile saying to me 'my glasses!' now the thing that is going to attack us doesn't know that he can't see anything</i> is said by the narrator to herself.
100	Something had brushed up against the tent.
108	<i>It's going to come down on us</i> is said by the narrator.

The final step in creating an Adequate Paraphrase is to combine the most heavily evaluated Story Event and Durative-Descriptive Propositions into a paraphrase that preserves the original ordering of the clauses. What follows is the Adequate Paraphrase for "Orégon":

While in Oregon where there was a warning about the potential for bear attacks, something brushed up against the tent of the narrator and her husband. The husband said, "Who's out there?" and then "Martine, my glasses!" The narrator said to herself "But why is this imbecile saying to me 'my glasses!' now the thing that is going to attack us doesn't know that he can't see anything" and then "It's going to come down on us".



### **5.3 PROBLEMS WITH THE POLANYIAN METHODOLOGY**

Because in many ways the Polanyian methodology is similar to the Labovian approach, some of the same problems as were enumerated in the critique of the Labovian methodology also exist with respect to the Polanyian methodology. Their definitions and views of evaluation and its role in narrative are quite similar and thus what was said in Chapter 3 regarding the difficulty of the notion of evaluation applies to the Polanyian approach as well.

#### **4.3.1 Problems with Applying the Polanyian Methodology to Conversational Narratives**

Although with the addition of the category of Non-Storyworld clause Polanyi's methodology is better able to handle conversational narratives, in applying the methodology the text is transformed into something that is not recognizable as the original narrative as it occurred initially. Therefore, the same point made about the Labovian methodology with respect to the obscuring of the text as it occurred is also a relevant argument against Polanyi's division of a narrative into independent clauses. Additionally, while the Labovian methodology leads to a text that typically has fewer clauses than an interactive representation of the same text, the Polanyian approach produces a text with many more clauses than the interactive model. This methodology creates a text that, because of the large number of clauses, is difficult to work with.

The Polanyian approach leads to an analysis that is in some cases unnecessarily complicated. Polanyi's definition of an independent utterance seems to be too broad for the type of analysis that is being done. The inclusion as separate independent clauses of unfinished phrases, hesitations, repetitions and false starts creates a representation of a narrative text that is not only unweildy and difficult to work with, but also leaves the analyst wondering what such a division of clauses adds to the methodology. There are several instances in the narrative text "Orégon" where such clauses seem not to serve any useful purpose. Line 20 in the interactive representation of "Orégon" results in six separate clauses within the Polanyian representation.

### **Interactive Representation**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 20 | y avait des des des de des genres de de montagne tout<br>autour       |
| 20 | there were some some some some some sort of of<br>moutains all around |

### **Polanyian Representation**

- |    |                         |
|----|-------------------------|
| 25 | y avait des             |
| 26 | des                     |
| 27 | des                     |
| 28 | de                      |
| 29 | des genres de           |
| 30 | de montagne tout autour |

25    there were some  
26    some  
27    some  
28    some  
29    some sort of  
30    of mountains all around

It is quite unclear how defining the independent clause in such a way contributes to a better analysis of narrative. Polanyi never refers to clauses such as 25-30 in her analysis and rather than helping the analyst learn more about narrative structure by separating them out, they seem rather to hinder the analyst by creating a representation that is difficult to work with because the number of clauses involved in a narrative is multiplied. Additionally, such clauses are also difficult to categorize as there is very little semantic material with which to determine their function. I have determined that clauses 26-30 are all Durative-Descriptive Clauses but this is based on their semantic relation to clause 25 which contains the imperfective verb *avait*. However, it would be impossible to categorize such clauses on their own content. Thus, it seems that it would be more sensible to break down material into clauses based upon its ability to be categorized independently.

Another contributor to the unweildiness of the Polanyian methodology is the transformation of the independent clauses into propositions. Again, it is not clear how exactly transforming narrative clauses into propositions aids the analyst in understanding narrative. In addition to further masking the spirit of the original narrative text, the need to create propositions also adds, seemingly unnecessarily, to the unweildiness of the methodology.

Polanyi herself seems to have difficulty applying her own stated methodology within her own analyses. When explicating her methodology, it is telling that Polanyi uses Labov and Waletzky's "Baddest Girl in the Neighborhood" as the example. This is a relatively short narrative with minimal conversational interaction. Later in her book, when it comes to the analysis of narratives from her own data such as "Eating on the New York Thruway", an actual conversational narrative, Polanyi does not follow her own instructions. She does not provide a full transcript of the narrative. This prevents an even rudimentary understanding of how the narrative actually unfolded. Then, in the course of the analysis, many clauses are omitted without an explanation. Are the clauses that are missing irrelevant or problematic? Or is the system of analysis simply too unwieldy to apply to a narrative more complex than the prototypically Labovian "Baddest Girl in the

Neighborhood"? In my attempt to apply Polanyi's methodology to "Orégon", the product was so extensive that it had to be relegated to an Appendix. While unweildiness itself should not be the sole criteria in determining the validity of a methodology, it seems as though going through such a lengthy and time-consuming process should yield terrific results so as to justify the effort. In the case of the Polanyian methodology, the product of the Adequate Paraphrase does not seem to justify the effort.

#### **4.3.2 Problems with the Notion of the Adequate Paraphrase**

The thrust of the Polanyian methodology for narrative analysis is to arrive at an Adequate Paraphrase of a given narrative, and to thereby conclude what information is most relevant to the narrator. But we must ask what such a paraphrase will tell us. What do we gain by knowing which information is most relevant to the narrator? It seems as though Polanyi may infer that by determining the parts of the narrative that are most crucial to the narrator that she has also revealed the information that wards off the *so what factor*. The so what factor refers to the underlying assumption in both the Labovian and Polanyian analyses that the narrator is constantly designing his or her narrative so as to ward off the dreaded potential audience retort "So what?". However, despite the assertion of the centrality of the so what factor according to these methodologies, the only way to

assess the so what factor is by focusing on the recipients who would be in the position to ask "So what?". Despite this reality, like the Labovian methodology, Polanyi's approach relies only on the narrator's perspective in determining the Adequate Paraphrase. Therefore, one of the most obvious flaws of the pursuit of the Adequate Paraphrase is that such an endeavor tells us nothing about how narratives are received by the audience members. The conversational co-participants cannot be ignored in an analysis of conversational narrative and the result of the Polanyian approach does just that. This is because the creation of the Adequate Paraphrase does not utilize Non-Storyworld clauses, which are the clauses produced by the co-participants. Therefore, the output of the Polanyian methodology does not really get us any further than the Labovian methodology despite the existence of the category of Non-Storyworld clause.

The Adequate Paraphrase is accomplished by determining the key events (most heavily evaluated Main Line Story Events) and crucial contextualizing information (most heavily evaluated Durative-Descriptive information). Implicit in this methodology is the notion that evaluation can be quantified. Polanyi notes that "the linguistic structure of the text itself, reveals what is most relevant to the teller" (16). However, one must ask not only whether or not such a quantification is possible but also what

such an analysis tells us about narratives told in interaction. Is not the perspective and contribution of the listener just as important as that of the narrator? An Adequate Paraphrase of a narrative may tell us what the narrative was about and what about the narrative was important to the narrator but it tells us nothing about how the narrative was received by the interlocutors, in other words, we learn nothing new about the interaction. A true Adequate Paraphrase would summarize not just those events that were important to the narrator, but also how those events were received by the conversational co-participants.

Another, and perhaps a more serious criticism of Polanyi's methodology and its intended results, is that the methodology presented by Polanyi does not seem to actually guide the analyst to an adequate paraphrase of a narrative. The application of the Polanyian methodology often leads to the exclusion of some clauses that seem essential as well as the inclusion of clauses that do not seem crucial to produce an adequate paraphrase. Recall from my discussion of applying Polanyi's methodology to "Orégon" that several adjustments had to be made in order to arrive at the Adequate Paraphrase. I stated that included in the list of most heavily evaluated propositions are propositions featuring clauses that contained eight or more points of evaluation with the following exceptions. Clauses 3, 11, 65, 85, 91, 96, and 97 were included

even though they did not have eight or more points because they complete ideas contained in clauses that did have eight or more points. Clauses 7, 24, 42, 45, 47, 150, and 153 were not included even though they did not contain eight or more points either because they were Non-Storyworld clauses or because they had only eight or nine points and would require the inclusion of even more marginal clauses to allow for the inclusion of a complete idea. Therefore, if I truly included only those propositions whose clauses contained eight or more points of evaluation then the list would look like this.

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| 6        | It was Oregon.   |
| 7        | Are there bears there in Oregon? is asked by the narrator.   |
| 14/16-19 | It was written on all of the tables "Keep food away. Put it in the car. Put the car far away from the tent. Bears attack". |
| 24       | We were in a hole.   |
| 32       | Bears attack.  |
| 42/45    | We were playing at   |
| 47       | It wasn't checkers.  |
| 61/66    | All of a sudden there was something there which was brushing against the tent.   |
| 62       | Something passes by quickly.   |
| 69       | <i>The husband said "who's out there?"</i>   |
| 70       | <i>"Who's out there?"</i> is said by the husband.  |



73/80	<i>The husband said "Martine! my glasses!"</i>
74/81 husband.	<i>"Martine! my glasses!"</i> is said by the
86-90	<i>He says to me 'my glasses!' now the thing that is going to attack us doesn't know</i> is said by the narrator to herself.
100	Something had brushed up against the tent.
108	<i>It's going to come down on us</i> is said by the narrator.
150 member.	<i>It was a bear?</i> was asked by an audience
153	<i>That it was probably a bear</i> was said by the husband.

Such a list of propositions leads to the following Adequate Paraphrase that does not seem to adequately paraphrase the narrative:

In a hole/valley in Oregon, where the narrator asks whether or not there are bears and where there was a warning about the potential for bear attacks and where the narrator and her husband were playing at something but it wasn't checkers, something, which passes by quickly, brushed up against the tent of the narrator and her husband. The husband said, "Who's out there?" and then "Martine, my glasses!" The narrator said to herself "He says to me 'my glasses!' now the thing that is going to attack us doesn't know" and then "It's going to come down on us". Whether or not it was a bear was asked by an audience member to which the narrator replied that her husband said that it probably was.

Details such as the fact that the narrator and her husband were in a valley and that they were playing at something that wasn't checkers hardly seem important enough details to make it into an

adequate paraphrase. Also, the conclusion of the narrator's husband's remark is omitted leading to a paraphrase that does not altogether make sense. Where the paraphrase seems improved, however, is with the inclusion of the questioning of the narrator by the audience member. Such an inclusion leads to a better sense of the interactivity of the narrative and the fact that there were some challenges by the audience members regarding the narrator's claim of danger. However, given the imperfect nature of the paraphrase produced, or the number of adjustments that were necessary to render the paraphrase adequate, Polanyi's methodology is not superior to the Labovian methodology in its results.

#### **4.3.3 Limits of an approach that is Narrator Focused**

We have just discussed some of the drawbacks of the notion of the Adequate Paraphrase, one being that its focus is entirely centered on the narrator. In her discussion of narrative, Polanyi discusses certain things narrators must do. For instance, Polanyi states that,

In telling a story, the narrator has two tasks: to give enough detail so that interlocutors understand the nature of the change brought about, and to differentiate among the various events and states which are used to tell the story so that it is clear to the interlocutors precisely which complex of circumstances and events should be used to infer the point being made (14).

Such tasks seem reasonable and in the data presented by Polanyi these tasks are always accomplished. However, what Polanyi does

not illustrate are stories where these tasks are not accomplished.

Polanyi goes on to suggest that,

In addition to monitoring the use of evaluative devices themselves, the narrator must also monitor the relative amount of evaluation accorded the many propositions. In order to assure each proposition the amount of foregrounding it should have, the teller must keep track of how much evaluation each proposition was accorded earlier in the telling (15).

What is not clear from Polanyi's assertion is what happens when a narrator does not do these things. Or what happens when a narrator does all of these things but they are not ratified by the audience.

Polanyi also proposes some things that recipients must do.

She suggests that,

The story recipients must acknowledge that a story has been told by responding to it in some way which indicates acceptance of the fact that it was told and which demonstrates an understanding of what it was about. Should they not do so, they will be assumed to be ignoring the fact of the telling and displaying a degree of contempt for the story and thus for the teller (32).

Again, situations like these do not appear in the data presented by Polanyi. Thus, while the existence of such a situation is suggested, what Polanyi fails to do is to show what this looks like. Polanyi also states that,

While story recipients must remain quiet and passive for the most part during the telling . . . there is a strong expectation that they will show their appreciation of the relevance of the storyworld propositions while the story is

being told using nods, minimal responses, laughter, and comments to express interest, sympathy, or surprise (35).

Such reactions are preferred but are not automatic. Story recipients do not always display such appreciation, or more accurately, the scope of such appreciation is not consistent. Polanyi does not illustrate her contention or what happens when appreciation is not forthcoming.

The truth is that a storyteller's explicit message is not always universally agreed upon by the members involved in the conversation. It is also true that not all storytellers' messages are delivered explicitly. The fact that Polanyi ignores the effects of the very Non-Storyworld whose analysis could provide insight into these issues is a major weakness of her methodology.

At the outset Polanyi seems to have made a major step forward with her methodology's ability to handle conversational narrative data with the creation of the category of Non-Storyworld clause. Unfortunately however, Polanyi does not seem to use this category of clause in her analyses. Rather, it seems as though the category merely exists so that anything that does not fit into another category will have a place. Providing a way in which to analyze such clauses would considerably strengthen the usefulness of the Polanyian methodology.

In particular, it seems as though an analysis of the Non-Storyworld clauses in a narrative may yield important insights into

the nature of interaction. Rather than an analysis which has as its focus the narrator of the type suggested both by Labov and Polanyi, an analysis of the Non-Storyworld clauses in a narrative would allow for a better understanding of how narratives are received by the conversational co-participants. In analyzing the Non-Storyworld clauses of three narratives from the Minnesota corpus "Orégon", "histoire-géographie, Christine", and "Nîmes", I suggest that looking at the quantity and evaluative content of Non-Storyworld clauses can lead the analyst to a better understanding of how narratives are received interactionally. It should be noted that it was necessary to slightly revise Polanyi's notation of the numbering of narrative clauses. I have bolded those clauses that were uttered by someone other than the narrator.

In "Orégon" (the Polanyian analysis for which has been illustrated at length above), there are a total of 94 Non-Storyworld clauses of which 37 are uttered by the story recipients. Thus, in this narrative, there is a balance that seems to indicate that the narrator has succeeded in conveying the intended information. I suggest that achieving this balance can be seen as the result of the narrator's ability. Such a balance indicates that the story recipients are involved in the telling of the narrative and such involvement is an indicator of interest in the narrative and therefore its success.

In some cases the Non-storyworld clauses which appear in this narrative are the result of a request by Martine for information or feedback. In clauses 5 (*je crois*) and 7 (*y a des ours là-bas en Orégon?*) Martine first expresses belief but not certainty in the location of her story and then voices a specific request for information. This request is answered by the external agreement of clause 8 (*oh oui*). In clauses 47-49 and 51-52 Martine again expresses uncertainty about the name of the game she and her husband were playing. This uncertainty is then expressed explicitly in clauses 54 and 55 (*je sais pas comment on dit en français*). These expressions of uncertainty are answered by the story recipients with external responses in clauses 50, 53, and 56. One can conclude therefore that one way that the narrator can ensure a balance of Non-storyworld clauses in their narrative is to elicit such clauses by requesting information from the story recipients.

Another type of Non-storyworld clause that can serve as an indicator of how a narrative is being received is laughter. In "Orégon" there are ten instances of laughter and nine of them emanate from the story recipients. Therefore, in Martine's story, it is the recipients who laugh the most, thereby showing their appreciation for Martine's narrative.

In "histoire-géographie, Christine" (for the full text of the narrative and as well as the complete Polanyian analysis of the narrative, see the Appendix), there are a total of 30 Non-Storyworld clauses, 18 of which are uttered by the story recipients. However, this seeming balance is deceptive as will soon become apparent. Here is a list of all of the Non-Storyworld clauses in the narrative.

**Non-Storyworld Clauses from "histoire-géographie, Christine"**

- |           |                                       |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| 1         | moi je me souviens                    |
| 5         | tu vois bien                          |
| <b>6</b>  | c'est ça                              |
| <b>7</b>  | oui                                   |
| <b>9</b>  | c'était le pire l'histoire-géographie |
| <b>10</b> | ah non!                               |
| <b>11</b> | j'ai eu une excellente note           |
| 12        | et alors                              |
| <b>13</b> | ah oui                                |
| <b>14</b> | mais toi t'es historienne!            |
| <b>15</b> | oui                                   |
| <b>16</b> | c'est ça!                             |
| <b>17</b> | c'est pour ça                         |
| <b>18</b> | que j'adorais ça!                     |
| <b>20</b> | l'histoire mon Dieu!                  |

<b>21</b>	mon Dieu!
<b>22</b>	c'est oh là là
24	attends!
28	parce que quoi crotte alors hein!
<b>29</b>	c'est vrai!
32	tu vois
36	(loud laughter)
37/ <b>37</b>	(laughter)
<b>38</b>	on dit (inaudible)
40	ouais
40-43	(uttered quickly and with laughter)
44	(loud laughter)
45-47	(uttered quickly and with laughter)
48	(loud laughter)
<b>49</b>	(laughter/more like a chuckle)
50	je crois
52	(laughter)

Clauses 1 (*moi je me souviens*) and 5 (*tu vois*) are used to appeal to the interlocutors for their attention to listen to a narrative as they flank clauses 2, 3, and 4 which constitute part of the crucial contextualizing information. Clauses 6 (*c'est ça*) and 7 (*oui*), which are both examples of external agreement to clauses 2,



3, and 4 seem to suggest that such attention has been granted to Christine. Thus, Christine continues with another durative-descriptive clause in clause 8 (*parce qu'on était nulle*). However, at this point it becomes clear that full attention to the narrative has not really been granted as Martine and Evelyne have a discussion about their thoughts on the topic presented by Christine in clauses 2, 3, 4, and 7. This takes place in clauses 9-11, 13-18, and 20-22 with Christine interjecting attempts to regain the floor in clauses 12, 19, and 23. It takes Christine's uttering of an external imperative in clause 24 (*attends!*) to regain the floor so that she can continue with her narrative. The next Non-Storyworld clause comes with Christine's external exclamation in clause 28 (*parce que crotte alors hein!*). The evaluation in this clause is ratified by the audience as is evidenced by the external agreement in clause 29 (*c'est vrai!*). However, beyond this point in the narrative there is an imbalance in the Non-Storyworld clauses produced. The audience only goes on to produce three more Non-Storyworld clauses which occur in clauses 37, 38, and 49 in its reaction to the narrative as compared with the ten Non-Storyworld clauses that are added by the narrator. In addition, a closer look at clauses 37 and 49 show that not only is the imbalance quantitative, it also exists in the level of enthusiasm displayed. Not enough of clause 38 is audible for it to be analyzed with confidence. Clause 37

represents laughter over the key event in clause 35 (*et puis on regardait les mecs*). However, this laughter follows the loud laughter of the narrator in clause 36 and is concurrent with further laughter of the narrator also in clause 37. In other words, although it is agreed by the recipients that the event narrated is funny, agreement over the degree of hilarity is not reached. The same scenario repeats itself with respect to clause 49, which also represents laughter over a key event. This time it is the event in clause 47 (*on se faisait du pain perdu*). This laughter can be more accurately characterized as polite laughter that certainly does not match the continuous laughter emitted by Christine in lines 40-48. It should be noted about laughter in "histoire-géographie, Christine" that there are eight instances of laughter and only two of them were emitted by the story recipients. Therefore, unlike what we saw in "Orégon" where it is primarily the recipients who show displays of laughter indicating that they find the story funny, in "histoire-géographie, Christine" it is the narrator who above all finds the story funny. This marks the end of recipient reaction/contribution to the narrative and falls short of the type of reaction for which Polanyi suggests that there is a "strong expectation".

Finally, "Nîmes" (see the Appendix for a full text of the narrative as well as the Polanyian representation of the narrative)

is also a narrative in which there does not seem to be agreement between the narrator and the conversational co-participants. In this case there are a total of 60 Non-Storyworld clauses, 25.5 of which are uttered by the narrator, Martine, and the other 34.5 of which are uttered by the story recipients. However, the content of the clauses uttered by the recipients is mostly negative and so the high level of feedback does not translate into a well-received narrative. Here is a list of all of the Non-Storyworld clauses in "Nîmes".

**Non-Storyworld Clauses from "Nîmes"**

3	euh
6	euh
<b>11</b>	(laughter)
<b>14</b>	le gars tu sais
<b>15</b>	ça peut lui
16	oui euh
18	non
19	mais
20	il était malade un peu mental
21	hein
22	il a eu des suites
<b>23</b>	ah tes amis ils sont
24	oui

25	mais
26	mes amis je les choisis (inaudible)
24-26	(laughter while speaking)
<b>27</b>	d'accords
28	alors euh
32	euh
36	alors
<b>43</b>	(laughter)
<b>45</b>	ça c'est l'exagération du m
<b>46</b>	du Midi
<b>47</b>	tu vois
<b>48</b>	(laughter)
<b>49</b>	on s'en était aperçu!
50	et alors
59	n'est-ce pas
<b>61</b>	elle exagère
66	euh
69	n'est-ce pas
<b>76</b>	(loud laughter)
<b>77</b>	oh mais y en avait un
<b>78</b>	y en avait un!
<b>79/79</b>	(laughter)

**80**           oui  
**82**           il aurait pu penser  
**83**           qui pour lui c'était son gagne-pain  
**84**           euh  
**85**           si  
**86**           ben oui  
88           oui mais tu sais  
89           que ces  
90           ces gens qui ont des problèmes existentiels  
**92**           oui mais (inaudible)  
**94**           tu aurais pu l'arrêter!  
**95**           moi je l'aurais dit  
**96**           "écoutes  
**97**           t'as"  
98           moi je trouvais ça marrant  
99           ça m'était jamais arrivé  
**100**          ça m'étonne pas  
**101**          ça m'étonne pas!  
102          ça m'était jamais arrivé  
103          (laughter)  
**104**          (pause, then voiced sigh)  
**113**          (soft laughter)

- 114**           c'est quand même bête ça  
**115**           Betsy est-ce que tu nous fais une  
**116**           une vinaigrette  
**117**           est-ce que tu utilises la vinaigrette?

In "Nîmes", there is a lot of interaction but that interaction becomes confrontational. I describe this interaction as confrontational because it contains instances of disagreement with the ideas that Martine is narrating. Pomerantz (1984) suggests that "Agreement is a preferred next action across a large diversity of initial assessments" (63-64). The major exception to this rule is the preferred behavior following a self-deprecating comment. Therefore instances of disagreement are not preferred and can be thought of as confrontational. The first instance of disagreement in "Nîmes" centers around the discussion of Martine's exaggeration. At first, the interaction on this topic seems to be lighthearted. It is first marked by laughter in line 43 after Martine claims that the entire population of Nîmes was on the particular street where her story was taking place. This is followed up by Betsy's direct statement exposing Martine's exaggeration when Betsy says in lines 45-47 that Martine typifies the exaggeration of the Midi region in France. All of the other co-participants display their agreement with Betsy by laughing in line 48. Martine, however, does not respond to these jeers by the audience but

rather simply continues with her narrative without acknowledging the reactions to her statement. She is again interrupted by Evelyne in line 61 who states less jovially than Betsy had earlier and directly that Martine is exaggerating. Martine continues to ignore these interruptions and continues with her story. Pomerantz notes that not responding to an assessment can be considered an instance of disagreement. When Martine does not respond to her co-participants assessments of her storytelling she is tacitly expressing her disagreement.

The other major issue provoking uncomfortable interaction in "Nimes" is how Evelyne and Christine question Martine's morality by suggesting that she should have acted differently when faced with the situation in the narrative. These are instances of strong disagreement according to Pomerantz's definition: "A strong disagreement is one in which a conversant utters an evaluation which is directly contrastive with the prior evaluation" (74) and lead to a very uncomfortable situation at the end of the narrative. First Evelyne remarks negatively about Martine's friend in lines 14-15. Martine immediately counters by making an excuse for her friend in lines 18-22, namely that he has mental problems. Here Martine uses a strategy of stereotyping her friend and thereby suggesting to her audience how they should adjust their interpretations of this person based on the stereotype that Martine

suggests. Ochs and Capps (2001) describe this phenomenon: "In some narrative interactions, tellers refer to a group stereotype to explain how a protagonist appears as well as acts" (213). Evelyne counters Martine's suggestion by calling into question Martine's ability to cultivate friendships with more "normal" people in line 23. Then a little later in the narrative after Martine delivers the punchline of the narrative (*le type qui dit "Je les ai vus! Ils étaient toute une bande! Ils se sont sauvés!"*), both Evelyne and Christine call into question the way in which Martine handled the situation. They both propose alternatives to how Martine reacted, suggesting how they would have acted in her place (Christine in line 94: *tu aurais pu l'arrêter!*; Evelyne in lines 95-97: *moi je l'aurais dit "écoutes t'as"*). Martine stands her ground saying in line 98 that she found the whole event to have been amusing but she fails to convince Christine and Evelyne to adopt her point of view. Christine utters the highly confrontational assessment of Martine (*ça m'étonne pas ça m'étonne pas*) which she repeats for emphasis in line 100-101. There is audible tension at the end which Evelyne finally breaks by abruptly changing the subject by questioning Betsy about something (*une vinaigrette*) totally unrelated in lines 115-117. Therefore, while there is significant interaction in this narrative, very little of it is positive, a factor that clearly influences the nature of the interaction. It is only through an analysis of the



Non-Storyworld clauses in this narrative that the true nature of this interaction is revealed.

Perhaps an appropriate way to objectively judge the success of a narrative is to compare the amount of positive feedback produced by the story recipients during a narrative to the amount produced by the narrator. This can be accomplished by counting the number of external exclamations, comments, agreement, disagreement, and demands about storyworld clauses in a narrative, labeling them as either positive or negative. I will hypothesize that a narrator's ability both to convey the events that they wanted to convey and to elicit agreement on the evaluation of those events to be successful if the narrative has as many as or more positive clauses from the recipients as it does from the narrator after subtracting out any negative external exclamations, comments, disagreements, and demands. The lists of the various types of Non-Storyworld clauses for each narrative to be analyzed can be found in the Appendix.

I should clarify here that I will not be using all Non-Storyworld clauses in this analysis. There is a whole category of Non-Storyworld clauses, which I will term Neutral Non-Storyworld clauses, that rather than telling us about the nature of the interaction taking place, serve instead the purpose of filling up space so that the speaker can think of what they want to say next.

These include such clauses as *eu*, *alors*, *ben*, *bon*, etc., all of which are neutral in that they indicate neither whether the interaction is proceeding positively or negatively. I must also clarify here that the terms I am using here of External Exclamation, External Comments, External Agreement, External Disagreement, and External Demands are terms used by Polanyi to describe Non-Storyworld clauses in her charts of the evaluation of a given narrative. She does not define these terms anywhere but I understand them as follows. The use of the word external simply refers to the fact that these clauses are all external from the storyworld. This is just another way of labeling them as being Non-Storyworld clauses. Exclamation refers to a clause that is emphasized phonologically and would warrant the use of an exclamation point. Comment refers to an utterance that in some way offers up a comment or a response about something in the narrative. Agreement refers to a clause that contains an affirmative response to a statement in the narrative. Additionally, agreement can only occur between the narrator and a recipient or vice versa. In other words, agreement between two recipients when such agreement goes against what the narrator is suggesting will be characterized as a comment. Examples of this phenomenon can be seen in lines 80 and 86 in "Nîmes". Disagreement refers to a negative response to a statement in the narrative. And finally,

Demand refers to a request made for information either by the narrator or the recipients.

Using such a system allows for some interesting observations. By the definition suggested above, as shown by the three tables of results below, none of these three narratives would be considered to be successful. "Nîmes", having so many negative comments and disagreement by the recipients that their feedback produces a negative result, is the least successful of the three. Additionally, doing such an analysis allows for the type of close inspection of the Non-Storyworld clauses which will result in a better understanding of the interactional aspects of the narratives in question.

**Positive feedback "Orégon"**

Negative Exclamations, Comments, and Demands are in **bold**

	<b>Narrator</b>	<b>Recipients</b>
<b>External Exclamations</b>	64, 71, 82, 98, 105, 109, 112, 186	20, 22, 53, 56, 63, 67, 71, 75, 76, 82, 92, 105, 112, 148, 157, 174
<b>External Comments</b>	5, 10, 47, 48, 49, 54, 55, 93, 125, 138, 139, 171, 145, 152, 153, 154, 155, 164, 165, 177, 182, 183, 185	21, 50, 114, 115, 135, 159, 160, 172
<b>External Agreement</b>	9, 57, 77, 161, 162, 163, 175	8, 158, 166
<b>External Disagreement</b>		
<b>External Demands</b>	7, <b>78</b>	143, 149, 150, <b>167</b> , <b>169</b>

**Total Positive Feedback**       $(8+22+7+1-1) = 37$        $(16+9+3+3-2) = 29$

**Positive feedback in "histoire-géographie, Christine"**

Negative Exclamations, Comments, and Demands are in **bold**

	<b>Narrator</b>	<b>Recipients</b>
<b>External Exclamations</b>	28, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52	14, 18, 20, 22, 37, <b>49</b>
<b>External Comments</b>	4, 32, 40, 50	9, 17, 38
<b>External Agreement</b>		6, 7, 13, 15, 16, 29
<b>External Disagreement</b>		10, 11
<b>External Demands</b>	<b>24</b>	
<b>Total Positive Feedback</b>	$(12.5+3.5-1) = 15$	$(5-1+3+6-2) = 11$

**Positive feedback in "Nîmes"**

Negative Exclamations, Comments, and Demands are in **bold**

	<b>Narrator</b>	<b>Recipients</b>
<b>External Exclamations</b>	21, 24, 25, 26, 79, 77, 103	11, 43, <b>48, 49</b> , 76, 78, 79, <b>100, 101</b>
<b>External Comments</b>	16, 19, 59, 69, 98, <b>46</b> , 99, 102 <b>82, 83, 85</b> , <b>115</b> ,	<b>14, 15, 23</b> , 27, <b>45</b> , 47, <b>61</b> , 80, <b>86, 104, 113, 114</b> , <b>116, 117</b>
<b>External Agreement</b>		
<b>External Disagreement</b>	18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 97 26, 88, 89, 90	92, 94, 95, 96,
<b>External Demands</b>		

$$\text{Total Positive Feedback} \quad (4+7-8.5) = 2.5 \quad (5.5-4+3-16-5) = -16.5$$

Talking about each narrative separately, I will discuss how doing such an analysis provides both more answers and more questions. In "Orégon", a look at the External Exclamations would seem to indicate that the recipients appreciated the narrative. There are ten instances of laughter by the recipients displaying that overall there was appreciation for the content of "Orégon". The imbalance in the Non-Storyworld clauses in this narrative comes primarily from the External Comments which arise as a result of the External Demand from Christine in line 143. A ratio of feedback indicating a more successful narrative in "Orégon" exists until Christine's External Demand in line 143. After this point, Martine utters one External Exclamation, 11 External Comments, four External Agreement clauses as compared with the three External Exclamations, four External Comments, two External Agreement clauses and five External Demands, two of which are negative uttered by the story recipients. In other words Martine utters 16 Non-Storyworld Clauses totaling 16 points in answering Christine's demand. In the same period the recipients utter 14 Non-Storyworld clauses totaling 12 points. But, even without this issue of contention at the end of the narrative there would still be a slight imbalance with Martine uttering more Non-Storyworld clauses than the other participants. Martine also

utters quite a few Non-Storyworld clauses when she is trying to determine the name of the game that she and her husband were playing. In this part of the narrative Martine utters five External Comments and one External Agreement clause. The recipients, on the other hand, only utter two External Exclamations and one External Comment. Although this point is far from crucial to the story, Martine still feels the need to resolve it before continuing with her story. Both Christine and Evelyne chime in with the name of the game that Martine is looking for and she is then able to resume the narrative. These episodes, while seemingly insignificant to the narrative as a whole, rather than suggesting awkwardness in the narrative actually contribute to the success of the story. Such an episode involves the co-participants in the narrative in that Martine requests their help in determining the name of the game that she and her husband were playing. An episode like this also helps create a sense of authenticity for the story. This phenomenon is noted by Tannen (1989):

In a way, such mental scavenging seems to be more for the speaker's satisfaction than for the hearer's. It is unlikely to make a difference to the hearer whether the event took place in 1966 or 1967. Yet retrieving the correct year, or feeling that one has retrieved it, seems to give satisfaction to a speaker. However, such evidence of struggle to retrieve correct details is not only a matter of the speaker's self-involvement: It also gives an impression of verisimilitude to a hearer (140-141).

Therefore the fact that Martine struggles to remember the name of the game that she and her husband were playing adds both a way for Christine and Evelyne to help in the creation of the narrative and therefore feel more involved in the narrative and also causes them to believe more in the authenticity of the story. If Martine goes to such trouble to get a small, seemingly insignificant detail right, then why would Christine and Evelyne doubt the larger details of the story? Therefore, while this episode does not seem to alter the effectiveness of the narrative, it instead calls into question the efficacy of such an analysis. However, it is only by doing such an analysis that such issues can be explored in more detail.

In "histoire-géographie, Christine", it is also of interest to inspect the various types of Non-Storyworld clauses more closely. With the analysis performed there seems to be more of a balance than there is and to understand the true nature of the interaction one must look at the semantic content of the Non-Storyworld clauses. The major imbalance in this narrative comes in the External Exclamations. As has already been pointed out, Christine utters many more External Exclamations than do the recipients. This is particularly salient when it comes to laughter. There are 12 instances of laughter from Christine and only two from the recipients (one of which was polite laughter that cannot be characterized as positive feedback). In addition, a closer look at

the External Exclamations uttered by the recipients show that four of them occur very early in the narrative before Christine has really gained the floor. Once Christine secures the floor in line 24, she receives very little positive feedback. After that point the imbalance is striking. Christine utters all 13 of her External Exclamations, three External Comments and the one abrupt External Demand, totaling 14 points. The recipients on the other hand only utter one negative External Exclamation, one External Comment and one External Agreement, totaling 1 point. From this perspective the failure of this narrative can be better understood.

In "Nîmes" this analysis gives a clear indication that interactively speaking, this narrative fails. This can easily be seen by looking at the content of the recipient's Non-Storyworld clauses. The whole way through the narrative Martine is being challenged by the recipients. Rather than simply allowing Martine to tell her story without providing positive (or negative) feedback as in the case of "histoire-géographie, Christine", in this narrative the recipients question how Martine handled the situation. A look at the External Comments uttered by the recipients show that the recipients were both vocal and negative. Of the 19 External Comments uttered by the recipients, 16 of them were negative. Also particularly negative were the five External Disagreement clauses uttered by the recipients. Additionally, the final two



External Exclamations were also quite negative. It is not common for such insistent disagreement to occur in conversational narrative. However, traditional narrative analysis techniques such as those proposed by Labov and Polanyi would not capture what was really going on in "Nîmes". Only an analysis of the Non-Storyworld clauses provides the analyst with a clear picture of the social outcome of interactive narrative.

#### **4.4 CONCLUSION**

While the Polanyian methodology provides the narrative analyst with more tools with which to evaluate narratives than does the Labovian methodology, it still falls short both in the stated goals and in its ability to describe the interactional component of conversational narrative. The division of the narrative into independent clauses and then into propositions is a tedious process and one that does not seem to hold a theoretical advantage over a less complicated approach. The creation of a chart revealing the evaluative structure of a narrative is also quite complicated. More importantly, Polanyi's contention that the evaluation in a narrative can be quantified thus leading the analyst to an Adequate Paraphrase of a narrative is not supported when her methodology was applied to narratives from the Minnesota corpus. Finally, although implicit in Polanyi's methodology are the ideas that narrators must provide enough detail and evaluation to

convince the recipients of their point of view and that story recipients must express acceptance and agreement to the narrative being told, Polanyi's methodology does not provide a way for such ideas to be verified. While Polanyi's methodology does provide the category of Non-Storyworld clause, it seems to exist merely to find a place for those clauses which do not fit into Polanyi's analysis.

I suggest that using the Non-Storyworld clause as the basis for analysis will lead to a better understanding of the interactive component of conversational narrative. In keeping with Polanyi's methodology, I took a quantitative approach to the analysis of Non-Storyworld clauses. However, in much the same way as when I applied Polanyi's methodology to arrive at an Adequate Paraphrase, I found that a purely quantitative approach was inadequate. I suggest that in order to arrive at a superior analysis of a narrative that a combination of a quantitative analysis as well as an analysis of semantic content must be utilised. A quantitative analysis, once performed, provides an excellent starting point for an analysis of the content. Doing the quantitative analysis shows the analyst which elements of a narrative should be further inspected. Once this has been accomplished the analyst can arrive at a better understanding of the interactive elements of conversational narrative and how interaction influences the course and the outcome of a narrative.

## **Chapter 5: Ochs and Capps (2001)**

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

Ochs and Capp's more recent approach to Narrative Analysis will be evaluated in this chapter. Their approach is considerably different from the Labovian and Polanyian structural approaches and allows for the analysis of less prototypical narratives. It is also a methodology that provides a mechanism for evaluating the content of a narrative. In criticizing structural approaches to narrative, Martin (1986) notes: "What is lacking, in any method that substitutes a sequence of abstract terms for the concrete actions of a story, is an explanation of how the actions interlock with each other to create a plot, and how formal patterns are related to the story's content" (97). This chapter will explore both the benefits of such an approach as well as its limitations. Special attention in this chapter will be devoted to a discussion and critique of the dimensions of tellability and moral stance as proposed by Ochs and Capps.

### **5.2 OCHS AND CAPPS METHODOLOGY: OCHS AND CAPPS (2001)**

Ochs and Capps (2001) have recognized the ubiquitousness of personal narrative and their study illuminates the nature of ordinary social exchanges. They stress that in their data,

The narrators are not renowned storytellers, and their narratives are not entertaining anecdotes, well-known tales, or definitive accounts of a situation. Rather, many of the narratives under study . . . seem to be launched without knowing where they will lead. In these exchanges, the narrators often are bewildered, surprised, or distressed by some unexpected events and begin recounting so that they may draw conversational partners into discerning the significance of their experiences. Or, narrators may start out with a seamless rendition of events only to have conversational partners poke holes in their story. In both circumstances, narratives are shaped and re-shaped turn by turn in the course of conversation (2).

In such situations Ochs and Capps contend that the makeup of a narrative is just as much within the control of the co-participants in the conversation as it is within the control of the narrator. They point out that "narrative becomes an interactional achievement and interlocutors become co-authors" (3). Thus, although Polanyi recognizes conversational narratives, her focus is still very much on the narrator. Ochs and Capps go beyond the mere recognition of conversational narratives and delve more deeply into the inner workings of such jointly constructed narratives to suggest that it is often the case that narratives are not precisely organized with a pre-determined beginning, middle and end, but are instead often discourse events which entertain multiple possibilities and outcomes suggested not only by the narrator, but also by the co-participants. One of the keys in their approach is the concept of sideshadowing, which they describe in the following way:

Against foreshadowing, sideshadowing champions the incommensurability of the concrete moment and refuses the tyranny of all synthetic master-schemes; it rejects the conviction that a particular code, law, or pattern exists, waiting to be uncovered beneath the heterogeneity of human existence. Instead of the global regularities that so many intellectual and spiritual movements claim to reveal, sideshadowing stresses the significance of random, haphazard and inassimilable contingencies, and instead of the power of a system to uncover an otherwise unfathomable truth, it expresses the ever-changing nature of that truth and the absence of any predictive certainties in human affairs (5-6).

Ochs and Capps note that texts that exhibit sideshadowing are difficult to describe and suggest that,

Those seeking a set of defining formal criteria for narrative, such as posited for classic narrative (exhibiting streamlined beginnings, middles, and endings), are faced with either excluding modern texts that exhibit sideshadowing or accepting that (1) the boundaries of narrative are fuzzy and (2) that narrative along with other forms of discourse allows authors and protagonists to imagine possibilities, weigh alternatives, shift mindsets, and act without knowing what lies in the future (6).

Ochs and Capps have developed an approach that is very different from the structural approaches of Labov and Waletzky (1967), Labov (1972) and Polanyi (1985) because they contend that "narrative bows to no simple generic blueprint that sets it apart once and for all from other forms of discourse" (18). Therefore, they have developed a new framework with which to approach the study of conversational narrative, something they term a dimensional approach to narrative. Instead of isolating a set of

distinctive features that always characterize narrative, they have formulated a series of "dimensions that will always be *relevant* to a narrative, even if not elaborately manifest . . . Each narrative dimension establishes a range of possibilities, which are realized in particular narrative performances" (19). Table 2 (from Ochs and Capps, 2001:20) reflects both the dimensions defined by Ochs and Capps and the possibilities for each dimension.

Table 2 Narrative dimensions and possibilities

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Possibilities</b>	
Tellership	One active teller	→ Multiple active co-tellers
Tellability	High	→ Low
Embeddedness	Detached	→ Embedded
Linearity	Closed temporal and causal order	→ Open temporal and causal order
Moral Stance	Certain, constant	→ Uncertain, fluid

Ochs and Capps point out that most research on narrative has had as its focus narratives which demonstrate traits which fall at one end of the spectrum of possibilities. That is to say that

most discourse analysts have studied narratives which have one active teller, who narrate a highly tellable story, one that is relatively detached from surrounding talk, has a linear temporal and causal organization, and has a certain moral stance. It is narratives of this type that result from the elicitation techniques used in the sociolinguistic interview and which therefore constitute the data used by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002). Ochs and Capps point out that much less is known about narratives whose characteristics lie at the other ends of their respective continua. These would be narratives that have multiple, active co-narrators, are perhaps not as tellable, are relatively embedded in the ongoing discourse, have a non-linear organization, and have an uncertain moral stance. Ochs and Capps suggest using their defined narrative "dimensions and their fields of possibilities to analyze how different interlocutors shape the telling of a narrative and how life events are structured through narrative form" (19). The narrative dimensions defined by Ochs and Capps provide a framework for the analysis of narratives, including those less prototypical and therefore heretofore less studied narratives. I will now look at each of Ochs and Capps' narrative dimensions in more detail and illustrate them with narratives from the Minnesota Corpus.

Ochs and Capps describe the notion of tellership in the following way:

The dimension *tellership* refers to the extent and kind of involvement of conversational partners in the actual recounting of a narrative . . . Possibilities range from a teller who basically recounts a narrative in front of a relatively passive audience . . . to a set of active *tellers* who collaboratively supply and elicit information and stances relevant to events that have transpired (24).

These two extremes are characterized by the terms *low involvement* and *high involvement*. Low involvement narratives are the kind of narratives analyzed by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972, 1997, 2001, 2002). For the most part the non-narrating conversational partner utters only the prompt for the narrative and the most minimal feedback necessary to keep the narrative going. It is for this reason that there is no allowance for Non-Storyworld clauses in the Labovian framework. Such low involvement narratives do not exist in the conversational context of the Minnesota corpus so I will return to a narrative from Labov and Waletzky (1967) to illustrate this type of narrative. Recall that in "Old Doc Simon" that the contribution of the interviewer consisted only of requests for the narrator to tell his story:

(Were you ever in a situation where you thought you were in serious danger of getting killed?) I talked a man out of -- Old Doc Simon I talked him out of pulling the trigger. (What happened?)



The interviewer asks the initial question which prompts the narrator to reveal what will become the abstract of a narrative which is revealed in its entirety after one further prompt by the interviewer. Then, once the narrator begins the narrative, there is no other utterance from the interviewer.

A high involvement narrative can result from a variety of circumstances. Conversational co-participants can be coaxed into co-telling by the narrator. They can also initiate co-telling by requesting elaboration, or clarification, or by disagreeing. The narratives of the Minnesota corpus are by and large high involvement narratives and all of these circumstances of co-telling occur. Sometimes a narrator will coax their conversational co-participants into co-telling by requesting information from them before continuing with their narrative. This occurs in "Orégon" when Martine coaxes Evelyne and Christine into helping her remember the name of the game that she and her husband were playing:

28	on joue au
29	à avec la lampe-là
30	on joue au
31	au c'est pas aux échecs c'est
32	manger les dames là
33	les pions

34 B.: les [dames? ]  
 35 M: [au black] gammon backgammon  
 36 C: au ja[quet! ]  
 37 M: [je sais] pas comment [on dit en français]  
 38 E: [au jacquet! ]  
 39 M: c'est au jaquet  
 40 ah on joue au jacquet

28 we play  
 29 in in the lantern light  
 30 we play  
 31 it isn't checkers it's  
 32 take the pieces  
 33 the pieces  
 34 B.: the [women?]  
 35 M: [ black ] gammon backgammon  
 36 C: ja[quet! ]  
 37 M: [I don't] know how[to say it in French]  
 38 E: [ jacquet! ]  
 39 M: it's jaquet  
 40 ah we are playing jacquet

There are also a few occasions in "Orégon" where the conversational co-participants ask for more information about the narrative as a way of initiating co-telling. Usually such questions arise when a co-participant seems to lack complete comprehension. That person will resolve the situation by requesting more information. Such occasions are resolved either with an acceptance of the answer or in a disagreement about the credibility of the narrative. In the following excerpt from "Orégon", Christine initiates co-telling by both asking for clarification on the events of the story and by disagreeing with the conclusions drawn by Martine.

- 98 C: [tu crois que c'était un ours?]
- 99 M: [ben Bill il dit que c'était  
un ours probablement on était on était dans on était  
dans]
- 100 ? [ (inaudible)  
]
- 101 M: la région des ours
- 102 C: oh dis donc
- 103 B: oh oui! c'est
- 104 ça peut être
- 105 vraiment dangereux
- 106 M: ah oui! oui ça peut être très dangereux c'est  
pour ça ils sont beaux sur les photos
- 107 C: oui mais ils attaquent pas euh

108 [sans motif en général]  
 109 M: [ (inaudible) ]  
 110 B: en général mais  
 111 C: mais si ils ont très faim euh  
 112 hein?  
 113 M: et oui  
 114 [mais alors il faudrait]  
 115 ? [ (inaudible) ]  
 116 M: les les les les ours de la région de l'Orégon là où  
 il fait froid tout ça  
 117 bon ils ont faim hein!

98 C: [do you think that it was a bear?]  
 99 M: [well Bill says that it  
 was probably a bear we were in the we were in]  
 100 ? [(inaudible)]  
 101 M: the region of bears  
 102 C: oh really  
 103 B: oh yes! it's  
 104 it can be  
 105 truly dangerous  
 106 M: ah yes! yes it can be very dangerous and it's for  
 that reason that they are beautiful in pictures  
 107 C: yes but they don't attack uh

108 [without a motive for the most part]  
109 M: [ (inaudible) ]  
110 B: for the most part but  
111 C: but if they are very hungry  
112 huh?  
113 M: why yes  
114 [but then it must be]  
115 ? [ (inaudible) ]  
116 M: the the the the bears in Oregon there where it is  
cold and all  
117 well they are hungry huh!

In line 98, Christine asks if they indeed saw a bear. This could be interpreted as a challenge to Martine and her husband's decision to abandon their tent. Martine answers by saying no, but that they saw enough for them to be convinced of the potential danger. Christine then follows up by asking if they thought it was a bear. Again Martine answers the question saying that Bill thought that it probably was. Answering in this way suggests that she was not the only one who felt this way, but that her husband felt the danger as well. This also places the primary responsibility for the decision to leave on her husband and not on herself. This makes it information that is not as easily challenged. She also points out that they were in the region where bears were known to be, as she

had stated at the beginning. At this point Betsy also speaks up corroborating the potential danger of the situation. Martine agrees with Betsy and then tries to wrap up the narrative by bringing them back to the current situation by referring back to the photo that had originally prompted the narrative in the first place in line 106. This attempt to conclude the narrative is not accepted by Christine, who is still not satisfied. She further probes by suggesting that generally speaking bears will not attack unless provoked. Then Betsy is about to come to Martine's defense when Christine seems to realize that perhaps her criticism is unfounded and she suggests a solution herself, namely that bears may attack if they are hungry. Martine seems to accept this solution by suggesting that the Oregon bears must be hungry as it is so cold there. This is not perhaps the most logical presumption (it seems that bears might also be hungry when it is warm outside) but is acceptable to all of the participants and the narrative is thus concluded.

Ochs and Capps note that another factor leading a narrative to be considered *higher involvement* is the use of reported speech: "a teller may be influenced by the thoughts and words of others who are not present and may assimilate these absent voices while recounting events" (24). This is often the case in Martine's narratives as reported speech is a device that she uses fairly



221 "but she's hallucinating"  
 222 E: (laughter)  
 223 M: everything  
 224 everything that I told Jean-Marc  
 225 but it's unbelievable!  
 226 E: so he takes you for euh  
 227 [for the Messiah now!]  
 228 M: [ practically ]  
 229 so in fact he sent me his girlfriends [his women  
 his]  
 230 C.,E.: [ (laughter)  
 ]  
 231 E: his harem!  
 232 M: [he says to me "this one should I trust her? what  
 do you think?]

In this instance, Martine uses the reported speech of Jean-Marc to demonstrate the change in his belief in her ability to read palms. In line 221 Martine uses reported speech to demonstrate Jean-Marc's disbelief in her ability to read palms. Then in line 232 Martine reports Jean-Marc's speech again, this time to show his complete trust in her ability. In such a way, Jean-Marc can be perceived as a co-teller of Martine's story.

Another type of active co-telling occurs when more than one conversational participant launches a narrative on a similar



subject. Ochs and Capps term this *launching a parallel story episode* and describe the phenomenon as follows: "the teller of one narrative touches off other tellings" (32). This situation occurs twice in the Minnesota corpus. The first instance occurs when each conversational participant tells a narrative about an academic struggle. First, Christine tells "histoire-géographie, Christine" which prompts Martine to tell "histoire-géographie", which in turn prompts Evelyne to tell "le grec". A similar situation occurs again when each conversational participant tells a narrative about having to eat a food that they did not like. First, Martine tells "pruneaux" which causes Christine to tell "boudin" which in turn causes Evelyne to tell "soupe" (See the Appendix for the full texts of all six of these narratives).

In describing the concept of tellability, the second narrative dimension outlined by Ochs and Capps, they state:

personal narratives vary in their quality as tellable accounts, that is, in the extent to which they convey a sequence of reportable events and make a point in a rhetorically effective manner. Highly tellable narratives are of such interest that they can be told again and still be appreciated (33).

Ochs and Capps also suggest that a high tellability narrative can result not only from a narration about events that are sensational but also when the events narrated are significant to the co-participants. They state:

The events may be unknown to interlocutors. Or an unknown or known event may have bearing on their future

lives, lending great value to the narrative account. In addition, a narrator may use rhetorical skills to transform even a seemingly prosaic incident into a highly tellable account (34).

There are many narratives in the Minnesota corpus which are high on the scale of tellability. One example of a narrative that is high on the scale of tellability is "Orégon" in which Martine narrates an experience that she and her husband had with a bear while camping. The very events described are sensational in nature (assuming we accept that there was, in fact, a bear), a fact that makes this a narrative that can be told again and again.

There are also narratives that are high in tellability because of their significance to the co-participants in the corpus. This is certainly the case for "histoire-géographie" given that it evokes a sense of shared community with Evelyne and Christine that does not exist in their conversations with Americans. An American listening to this story would not be able to participate in the same way as Christine for instance. It seems that part of Christine's insistence that this portion of the exam was written as opposed to oral was just her way of asserting her cultural knowledge of the baccalauréat process and a way of signalling her identity with the French micro-community which is gathered in this conversation.

Another instance of shared identity being communicated through one of Martine's narratives with the result being a narrative of high tellability because of its significance to the

interlocutors is in "rouge et vert", the story of Martine's husband's boss who wears the red and green suit at Christmastime. As Johnstone (1990) points out:

From the perspective of an individual teller, stories are about events that turn out to be special. What counts as being out of the ordinary, though, shows what is ordinary; story themes point to cultural norms about how the unusual is to be made sense of and reacted to (37).

The fact that this man would wear a red and green suit seems not simply out of the ordinary or in bad taste, but rather something which in their culture would be unimaginable to this group and is something that they all agree on. If this were an American audience, perhaps the red and green suit may be seen as a tacky display of poor taste, although it would hardly be viewed as unimaginable given the season. These are just two examples of many instances in the corpus where high tellability is the result of the displayed shared identity of Christine, Evelyne, and Martine. Bonikowski (1999) explores this issue of how Christine, Evelyne and Martine display their shared cultural norms throughout the Minnesota corpus in more detail. She contends that the members in the corpus establish their shared identity through the definition of both what characteristics constitute their own group contrasted with those characteristics that constitute the culture within which they all find themselves immersed. Bonikowski states:

When the French lecturers spend time discussing their stereotype of self, they are both affirming other shared

cultural experiences and values, and also creating a consensus about what they consider to be important group characteristics; that is, they are creating an auto-stereotype. Through this process of constructing their auto-stereotype, they are reaffirming their individual values, and justifying their own group membership.

Once there is a concept of ingroup, there will be an outgroup, or 'stranger.' Stereotypes of this 'stranger' are a second tool used by the group in order to build consensus about cultural experiences, beliefs and values. Through agreement about what is 'other,' the members of the ingroup further define what belongs to the realm of 'one's own' and further justify their own group membership (14).

Both of the examples mentioned above, "histoire-géographie" and "rouge et vert", help establish the shared identity of the three French lecturers. The "histoire-géographie" narrative puts all three conversationalists into a group that can commiserate with each other with respect to this aspect of French culture. By reliving their experiences through the co-construction of the narrative, these three people "justify their own group membership". On the other hand, "rouge et vert" clearly constitutes an example of these three French women's stereotype of the outgroup. By all agreeing that the actions of the other are unimaginable they reinforce their own ingroup identity. In this way Martine's narratives on topics that she knows will be appreciated by her co-participants should be interpreted as being high on the scale of tellability.

Finally, there are also examples from the Minnesota corpus where the use of rhetorical skills is used to create a highly tellable

narrative out of an event that is less than sensational. One such example is in the narrative "pruneaux" (see Appendix 4 for the full text of the narrative). In this narrative Martine tells about a time in her childhood when she was forced to eat something that she did not like. This experience is really quite commonplace, not at all extraordinary in terms of its uniqueness. Despite this, Martine transforms her particular experience into something that is highly entertaining. Martine uses rhetorical devices such as variances in the rate and volume of her speech, repetition and lexical choices that create emphasis that render this narrative highly tellable. Christine and Evelyne respond very positively to this narrative with laughter and encouragement. They demonstrate through their reactions that they are enjoying the narrative and the level of detail that is being revealed. This is a context where Christine and Evelyne seem to appreciate learning about Martine and Martine responds to this encouragement by continuing to tell stories which reveal aspects of her identity, even if they do not necessarily narrate events that are sensational. Martine has a way of transforming the events in her life, whether spectacular or pedestrian, into narratives that are highly tellable by Ochs and Capps definition.

Low tellability narratives result when narrators do not necessarily wish to tell a narrative but are coaxed into doing so

anyway. When this happens Ochs and Capps suggest that the resulting narratives contain many false starts and do not always have a clear sense of direction. This can occur if a narrative is requested, such as when a parent asks their child to tell about their day. The unwilling telling of a narrative can also be induced by the context of a conversation. I noted above that there are two instances in the Minnesota corpus where a topic comes up and each participant tells a narrative. Remember that Ochs and Capps termed this *launching a parallel story episode*. On both such occasions Evelyne is the last to launch her narrative and in both cases the resulting narrative can be considered to be low on the scale of tellability. In "le grec" (see Appendix 7 for a full text of the narrative), Evelyne seems somewhat confused as to what she wants to be saying. Her speech is riddled with false starts. This is especially evident in the section from lines 9-17.

9	E:	j'ai eu
10		oui c'est ça
11		j'ai eu attends
12		j'ai dû avoir quelque chose comme 4 sur 20
13		ou un truc comme ça
14		heureu-
15		oh le grec là j'en pou-
16		alors le grec c'était horrible

17           je  
 18           j'avais horreur de ça  
  
 9       E:    I got  
 10           yes that's it  
 11           I got wait  
 12           I must have gotten something like 4 out of 20  
 13           or something like that  
 14           hap-  
 15           oh Greek that I cou-  
 16           well Greek was horrible  
 17           I  
 18           I hated it

Evelyne just cannot seem to decide where she wants to go with this story. There are virtually no details for the co-participants to try to imagine what it was like for Evelyne. Rather than describing a specific incident when her professor asked her a question that she did not know the answer to, for example, Evelyne keeps her narrative very vague. These features lead "le grec" to be considered a narrative of low tellability. A similar scenario occurs with the telling of "soupe" (see Appendix 8 for the full text of the narrative) which is also a narrative of low tellability.

The next narrative dimension in Ochs and Capps' framework is embeddedness. Embeddedness is described in the following way: "The extent to which a personal narrative is an entity unto itself, separate from prior, concurrent, and subsequent discourse, is related to turn organization, thematic content, and rhetorical structuring" (36). Therefore a narrative can either be relatively detached or embedded. Detached narratives are delivered in turns that are more lengthy than are found in normal conversational interaction. Detached narratives can also be so characterized if their topic is not relevant to the surrounding conversation. Embedded narratives on the other hand contain turns at talk that mimic those found in normal conversation and are thematically linked to the conversation at hand. Ochs and Capps describe the sources of the non-narrator turns at talk in an embedded narrative as follows: "interlocutors unfamiliar with the incident recounted make assessments, request clarification, ask information questions, provides background information, and otherwise provide substantial narrative elements" (39). The narratives found within the Minnesota corpus generally fall on the more embedded end of the scale between detached and embedded. This is largely due to the conversational context of the corpus. Many of the narratives arise from the conversation at hand. Consequently, there is quite a bit of co-telling involved in the narratives resulting



in the turn-taking contained within the narratives to look much like that of the conversation at large. For instance "Orégon" arises in the conversation after Christine remarks about a picture of a bear in a magazine that she was looking at during the conversation. Also, in the 117 lines of discourse in "Orégon", there were 50 separate turns at talk and 31 of the lines were uttered by someone other than the primary narrator. Therefore "Orégon" can be considered to be more embedded than detached.

The next narrative dimension defined by Ochs and Capps is linearity: "The dimension of linearity concerns the extent to which narratives of personal experience depict events as transpiring in a single, closed, temporal, and causal path or, alternatively, in diverse, open, uncertain paths" (41). Thus relatively linear narratives contain a series of events that take place one after another in succession. Nonlinear narratives, on the other hand, present events whose relation to one another is not necessarily clear. Ochs and Capps explain: "In recounting relatively nonlinear narratives, tellers display various reasons for blurring the relation of one event to another, including confusion, disagreement, and memory lapses" (42). Such narratives contain the earlier described concept of sideshadowing. This is particularly the case when a narrator suggests a hypothetical alternative view of events from those presented as having occurred in the narrative. One such

narrative in the Minnesota corpus, "Nîmes", occurs as Martine describes an incident where one of her friends knocks over a market display in the streets of Nîmes. In this narrative both Martine and the other conversational co-participants suggest multiple possibilities for what might have occurred and what did occur. In describing the reasons behind her friend's decision to knock over the market display Martine offers two alternatives. First, in her description of her friend she suggests that her vegetarian friend is disgusted with the idea that people are profiting from the killing of animals. Martine says, "ce copain qui est végétarien euh ne peut pas supporter l'idée qu'on tue de la volaille pour la manger" (this friend who is vegetarian uh can't stand the idea that birds are killed for food). Then, in the following excerpt, Evelyne comments negatively about the situation that Martine is narrating, and Martine offers up an alternative explanation for her friend's behavior:

- 10 E: [ le gars tu sais ça peut lui ]  
11 M: [oui euh ça va tellement être mélangé]  
12 non mais il était malade  
13 un peu  
14 mental  
15 hein il a eu des suites

10 E: [ the guy you know he could ]  
 11 M: [yes euh it's going to be really mixed up]  
 12 no but he was sick  
 13 a little  
 14 mental  
 15 uh he had some episodes

In this excerpt, Martine suggests in lines 12-15 that another reason her friend may have acted as he did was because he was mentally unstable. Martine voices this possibility again in lines 61-63:

61 M: oui mais tu sais que  
 62 ces ces gens  
 63 qui ont des problèmes existentiels

61 M: yes but you know that  
 62 these these people  
 63 who have existential problems

suggesting perhaps that it is this explanation that she has chosen for her friend's actions. However, the fact that the two alternatives were presented leads to uncertainty over what the underlying cause of Martine's friend's actions was.

Martine is not the only participant in this narrative to offer alternative scenarios. Both Christine and Evelyne suggest

alternatives for the way Martine handled the situation. Once Martine's friend had announced his intentions, Martine twice states that she acted (or failed to act) out of disbelief.

28            alors je me suis dit il va jamais le faire  
39            je dis "il va pas le faire"

28            so I said to myself he's never going to do it  
39            I say "he's not going to do it"

However, Evelyne and Christine both offer alternative reactions to the situation. First in lines 57-58, Evelyne suggests an alternative reaction for Martine's friend to which Christine agrees in line 59. Then in lines 67 and 68 Christine and Evelyne each offer alternatives to Martine's reaction. Christine suggests in line 67 that Martine should have stopped her friend from going through with his stated intentions. Evelyne in line 68 also starts to offer her own suggestion of what she would have said to the friend until she is cut off by Martine.

57    E:    il aurait pu penser qui pour lui c'était son  
             gagne-pain euh  
58            [si]  
59    C:    [ben] oui  
67    C:    tu aurais pu l'arrêter!  
68    E:    moi je l'aurais dit "écoutes [t'as]"

57 E: he could have thought that for him it was his  
means of living euh

58 [yes]

59 C: [well] yes

67 C: you should have been able to stop him!

68 E: I would have said to him "listen [you have]

Finally, two alternative evaluations of the situation narrated are offered. In line 69, Martine suggests that she thought that the events that she had described were funny. Christine, however, offers an alternative assessment in line 82; she feels as though the situation were dumb.

69 M: [moi] je trouvais ça  
marrant

82 C: c'est quand même bête ça

69 M: [ I ] thought it  
was funny

82 C: that is nevertheless dumb

At any rate, the linearity of the narrative is altered by all of these conflicting possibilities that are raised by Martine and the other conversational co-participants rendering "Nîmes" a narrative that is relatively nonlinear.

The final narrative dimension in Ochs and Capps' framework is moral stance. They state:

Central to narrative perspective is the *moral stance* assumed by tellers and protagonists. Rooted in community and tradition, moral stance is a disposition towards what is good or valuable and how one ought to live in the world. Human beings judge themselves and others in relation to standards of goodness: they praise, blame, or otherwise hold people accountable for their comportment (45).

Ochs and Capps suggest that people use personal experience narratives as a way to make their moral views known. They contend that narrators create moral agents out of the protagonists in their narratives. They also suggest that narrators by and large use their narratives to make themselves seem to be morally superior. The result is that the moral stance in most narratives can be characterized as certain or constant.

In the vast majority of cases, narrators tell narratives that portray themselves in a positive light. One such narrative in the Minnesota corpus is "couscous" (See Appendix 11 for the full text of the narrative). In this narrative, in which Martine tells about how she dealt with one of her student's interest in learning how to prepare couscous, Martine portrays herself in a positive light on more than one level. First, she gives evidence of her culinary knowledge and expertise, especially when it comes to preparing couscous. The following excerpts from the narrative show how

Martine does this. In line 11 and 13 Martine sets the foundation for her authority on the subject.

11 M: évidemment experte en la matière

13 M: [ je leur ai tout dit  
]

11 M: clearly an expert on the subject

13 M: [ I told them everything ]

Evelyne ratifies Martine's expertise by expressing an interest in having Martine explain how to make couscous to her in lines 12 and 16-17:

12 E: [il faudrait que tu me dises parce que moi je sais  
pas]

16 je connais pas vraiment

17 tout ce qui y a

12 E: [you must tell me because I don't know]

16 I don't really know

17 all that there is

Then, upon being simply asked for the recipe by her student, Martine further asserts her authority. Martine takes the preparation of couscous so seriously that she considers it to be an insult that someone would simply ask her for her recipe, as can be seen in the following lines from "couscous".

36 je dis mais  
 37 "quel insulte!"  
 38 le le couscous c'est le genre de plat justement  
 que même si on a la recette  
 39 ça ne marchera pas  
 41 M: [il faut l'avoir vu] fait  
 43 M: non non mais c'est ça  
 44 c'est ça  
 45 y a des  
 46 y a des étapes  
 48 M: [qui se ] font avec [ la main même ]  
 51 M: et si tu le fais  
 52 si tu le fait dix minutes de trop  
 53 il va être raté  
 54 il va être mastoc  
  
 36 I say but  
 37 "what an insult!"  
 38 couscous is the type of dish that even if you  
 have the recipe  
 39 it simply won't work  
 41 M: [you must see it] made  
 43 M: no no but that's it



44           that's it  
45           there are  
46           there are steps  
48    M:   [which are] done by [           hand           ]  
51    M:   and if you cook it  
52           if you cook it ten minutes too long  
53           it will be ruined  
54           it will be lumpy

Then Martine (along with some co-narration by Christine and Evelyne) create an image of the American student who has shown interest in having the recipe as someone who doesn't know the first thing about cooking. Martine suggests that this is a recipe that cannot possibly be created without first having witnessed an expert prepare it. This point is taken up by Christine who implies with the mention of *McDo* (line 49) that an American student would naturally not be versed in the preparation of an involved dish.

In the following exchange this suggestion is further emphasized with Martine's description of her student as being surprised that the preparation of the dish would take up an entire afternoon. Evelyne also jumps in to suggest that the student must have conceived of the preparation in terms of complexity similar to that of macaroni and cheese or some other meal-in-a-box.

87            quand je lui ai dit que ça prenait toute une  
               après-[midi]  
 90    M:                            [(inaudible) elle a pensé] que c'était  
               le plat  
 91            n'est-ce pas  
 92            qu'on [faisait en demi-heure (inaudible)]  
 93    E:                            [oui non mais elle pensait qu'on ]  
               l'achetait comme tous les  
 94            les choses  
 95            tu ajoutes un peu d'eau  
 96    M:            voilà!  
 97    C:            voilà!  
 98    E:            et puis [ça se fait]  
 99    M:                            [alors euh]  
 100            non  
 101            quand je lui ai dit que ça prenait tout l'après-  
               midi déjà  
 102            euh ça l'a un peu  
 103            surprise

87            when I told her that it takes an entire after[noon]  
 90    M:                            [ (inaudible) she thought ] that it was a  
               dish  
 91            right  
 92            that was [made in half an hour (inaudible)]

93 E: [ yes no but she thought that it ]  
 could be bought like every  
 94 thing  
 95 you add a little water  
 96 M: voilà!  
 97 C: voilà!  
 98 E: and then [it's done]  
 99 M: [ so euh ]  
 100 no  
 101 when I told her that it takes an entire afternoon  
 already  
 102 euh that surprised her  
 103 a little

This image of the culinarily inept American sets up the logical contrast of Martine as the all-knowing expert. This image of Martine is also light-heartedly joked about by both Evelyne and Christine in lines 77-78 and 80.

77 E: [vous pouvez prendre des  
 photos!]  
 78 je ne vous inter[dis pas de prendre quelques  
 photos]  
 80 C: [je signerai les autographes éventuellement]

77 E: [ you can take some  
 pictures!]

78 I will not stop you[from taking a few pictures]

80 C: [I will be so kind as to sign autographs]

Such suggestions would only be realistic for a world famous chef such as Jacques Pépin or Jean-Georges Vongerichten. However, the fact that they are even joking about it suggests that they recognize Martine's talent as well as her determination. The seriousness with which Martine approaches the preparation of this dish is evident through her narrative and helps create a positive image of Martine both as a member of Algerian culture who prizes its culinary traditions and as somewhat of an amateur chef.

Martine also portrays herself positively by displaying her dedication to her students. This dedication is manifested through Martine's offer to her student to come to her house to demonstrate to her and her family how to prepare couscous:

67 je lui ai dit

68 euh

69 E: (laughter)

70 M: si vraiment ça intéresse votre famille je veux  
bien venir

71 E: mm hmm

72 M: le faire

73 E: mm

74 M: et puis alors vous pouvez me regarder

75            enfin tu pourras me regarder  
 76            et puis comme ça [tu sauras le faire pour la  
                prochaine fois]  
  
 67            I told her  
 68            euh  
 69    E:    (laughter)  
 70    M:    if your family is really interested I would like to  
                come  
 71    E:    mm hmm  
 72    M:    and do it  
 73            E:    mm  
 74    M:    and so then you can watch me  
 75            so you will be able to watch me  
 76            the then this way [you will know how to do it for  
                the next time]

This idea is further reinforced by Martine's repeated suggestion  
 first in lines 83-85, and then again in lines 104-111.

83            [j'ai dit à la limite]  
 84    E:    [    (laughter)    ]  
 85    M:    je préfère venir passer une après-midi  
 104            alors je lui ai dit  
 105            parce que  
 106            vraiment

107            enfin moi ça me dérangerait pas  
108            euh et puis  
109            et puis je préfère le montrer comment on le fait  
110            et puis  
111            comme ça la prochaine fois tu pourras le faire  
              pour ta famille

83            [I said at the very least]  
84    E:    [            (laughter)            ]  
85    M:    I prefer to come spend an afternoon  
104            so I told her  
105            because  
106            truly  
107            well it would not bother me  
108            euh and then  
109            and then I prefer to show how to do it  
110            and then  
111            that way the next time you will be able to make  
              it for your family

The fact that such an action truly is above and beyond the call of duty for a teacher is underscored by the student's father's surprised response in lines 128-129 to Martine's proposition.

128            Papa est très impressionné par l'idée d'un  
              professeur

129 de français qui va venir à la maison

128 Papa is quite struck by the idea of a French  
129 professor who is going to come to the house

In Martine's reaction to this comment in lines 132-140, however, she downplays the significance of her suggestion, presenting yet another positive portrayal of herself as someone who gives of her time selflessly.

132 alors je lui ai dit

133 je lui ai dit "mais enfin Swan il faut dit à votre  
Papa

134 que je suis professeur de 8 à 9 chaque jour

135 E.,C.: (laughter)

136 C: et le reste

137 E: [ (laughter) ]

138 M: [après 9 heures]

139 y a plus de professeur y a Martine Karsten

140 une une une une dame de 23 ans très simple

132 so I said to her

133 I said to her "but well Swan you must tell your  
Papa

134 that I am only a professor from 8 to 9 each day

135 E.,C.: (laughter)  
 136 C: and otherwise  
 137 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 138 M: [after 9 o'clock]  
 139 there is no longer a professor there is Martine  
 Karsten  
 140 a a a a very simple woman of 23

Here Martine makes it seem as though it is not a big deal for her to spend her time going to a student's house to teach the student and her family how to make couscous. Such a statement makes Martine seem very selfless and humble. Altogether, the narrative puts Martine in a very positive light and is thus a narrative with a positive and certain moral stance.

There are, however, also narratives in which the moral stance created by the narrator is uncertain or unstable. Ochs and Capps suggest that "tellers who initially appear certain may find their moral stance unravel as the telling proceeds . . . Moral stance becomes destabilized when it is directly or indirectly challenged by another co-teller" (51). This is clearly the case in "Nîmes" (for the full text of this narrative, see Appendix 10). In this narrative, Evelyne and Christine question Martine's morality by suggesting that she should have acted differently when faced with the situation in the narrative. First Evelyne remarks negatively about Martine's friend in line 10.



10 E: [ le gars tu sais ça peut lui ]

10 E: [ the guy you know he could ]

Martine immediately counters by making an excuse for her friend - namely that he has mental problems.

12 non mais il était malade

13 un peu

14 mental

15 hein il a eu des suites

12 no but he was sick

13 a little

14 mental

15 uh he had some episodes

Here Martine uses a strategy of stereotyping her friend and thereby suggesting to her audience how they should adjust their interpretations of this person based on the stereotype that Martine suggests. Ochs and Capps (2001) describe this phenomenon: "In some narrative interactions, tellers refer to a group stereotype to explain how a protagonist appears as well as acts" (213). Evelyne counters Martine's suggestion by calling into question Martine's ability to cultivate friendships with more "normal" people.

16 E: ah tes amis



breaks in lines 83-85 by abruptly changing the subject to question Betsy about something totally unrelated.

83 E: Betsy est-ce que tu nous fais une  
84 une vinaigrette  
85 est-ce que tu utilises la vinaigrette?

83 E: Betsy did you make us this  
84 vinaigrette  
85 do you use a vinaigrette?

This narrative represents a rarity in the corpus with respect to how it calls into question Martine's morality. Additionally, "Nîmes" is certainly a highly tellable event, given its unusual events. Ochs and Capps (2001) note: "It has been widely noted that tellers are prone to communicate unusual life events. These are the events that people notice and that are of interest to others in one's community. In addition, these events may be puzzling or evoke strong psychological reactions" (130). The events of this story are definitely unusual and puzzling if not ones that put Martine in a positive light. This is an example of a narrative where the moral dimension lies at the uncertain end of the continuum.

### **5.3 APPLYING THE OCHS AND CAPPS APPROACH TO THE MINNESOTA CORPUS**

The framework for narrative analysis outlined by Ochs and Capps represents an important shift in the field of sociolinguistics in general and the field of narrative studies in particular towards methodologies that privilege the context of the discourse under analysis. While Polanyi's methodology allowed for the existence of conversational interaction within narrative, such interaction was clearly not the focus of analysis. The Ochs and Capps methodology, on the other hand, provides a framework within which narratives that are rich in interaction can be addressed. Ochs and Capps' approach is ethnographic in nature and is therefore highly focused on the context in which the narrative discourse is being produced. Duranti (1997) describes ethnography in the following way:

. . . an ethnography is the written description of the social organization, social activities, symbolic and material resources, and interpretive practices characteristic of a particular group of people. Such a description is typically produced by prolonged and direct participation in the social life of a community and implies two apparently contradictory qualities: (i) an ability to step back and distance oneself from one's own immediate, culturally biased reactions so to achieve an acceptable degree of "objectivity" and (ii) the propensity to achieve sufficient identification with or empathy for the members of the group in order to provide an insider's perspective - what anthropologists call "the emic view" (85).

Therefore, it should be noted that while Ochs and Capps obtained their data using an ethnographic approach, I will attempt to apply their methodology to the data within the Minnesota corpus even though ideally I would have more information available to me than I do about the context of these conversations. This next section will discuss some of the advantages and disadvantages of the approach suggested by Ochs and Capps. The main advantage of their approach is its ease at handling data that were not as well suited to earlier structural approaches. Ochs and Capps' methodology also allows for different types of analyses that are more descriptive in nature to be performed. However, the lack of structure inherent in such analyses can also be viewed as a weakness. Many of the narrative dimensions suggested by Ochs and Capps lend themselves to analyses that are plagued by the intentional fallacy. Such problems will also be discussed in this section.

### **5.3.1 Benefits of the Ochs and Capps Methodology for Conversational Data**

In the last two chapters I have discussed the drawbacks of the methodologies presented by Labov and Polanyi as stemming primarily from the fact that they do not provide adequate means to analyze conversational narratives of the type contained within the Minnesota corpus. In this respect the methodology for narrative analysis presented by Ochs and Capps represents a major

breakthrough. The book in which their methodology is laid out is called *Living Narrative*, a title which indicates that their approach has been designed to be able to analyze the types of narrative which occur in the course of daily interactions. Such interactions are more conversational in nature and thus are very different from the types of narratives that the more structural methodologies were designed to accommodate. The narrative data from the Minnesota corpus that is being analyzed in this dissertation more closely resembles the data utilized by Ochs and Capps and so therefore their approach works well.

Another benefit of Ochs and Capps' approach is that narrative data being analyzed using this methodology can be represented in a way that preserves the integrity of the conversation as it occurred in real time. In describing the methodologies proposed by Labov and Polanyi it was noted that in order to carry out an analysis using one of their approaches it was first necessary to transform the narrative into a series of clauses. These clauses were defined in a structural way that did not necessarily correlate with how the clauses were uttered in the context of the actual discourse. It was suggested that such requirements obscured elements of the discourse leading to a representation of the narrative that did not necessarily resemble the actual speech event. This is particularly true with respect to

overlap which was not representable in either approach. While Ochs and Capps do not propose a specific methodology for the representation of a narrative text, their approach does not preclude a transcription style that allows for a more accurate representation. Therefore, a benefit of the Ochs and Capps methodology is that it allows me to use the transcription methodology that I described in detail in Chapter 2.4.

Also, the fact that the Ochs and Capps' methodology is not structurally based allows for analyses that have as their focus elements of discourse that are less tangible. This methodology provides the analyst through the various narrative dimensions with a means of discussing the content of a narrative. Just through the process of illustrating these dimensions in the first part of this chapter we learned that "Nîmes", for instance, is a narrative which is highly tellable, non-linear, and of uncertain moral stance. On the other hand, we discovered that "Orégon" is a narrative of high involvement, as well as being highly tellable and embedded. While analyses of a narrative's content consequently open themselves up to criticism because of their lack of structural bases, they remain important nonetheless. I will look a little later in this chapter at the ways that such analyses can be criticized, but for the moment I will try to illustrate the types of analyses that such a methodology encourages.

For instance, it has been suggested that the methodologies proposed by Labov and Polanyi only allow for a focus on the contribution by the primary narrator in a given narrative. While each methodology alludes to the importance of the reaction to the narrative by the conversational co-participants, neither provides a way to analyze such reaction. This issue was discussed earlier as the *so what factor*. Within the narrative dimensions proposed by Ochs and Capps, on the other hand, discussion about audience reaction to a narrative is possible. Therefore, using the Ochs and Capps methodology as a base, it becomes plausible to explore the differences in audience reaction that result when that audience is presented with different narratives from various narrators. In other words, how does the same audience react differently to different narrators within the group? Most people will intuitively agree that some people are more gifted at storytelling than others, but what does this look like and can it be analyzed? I propose that an analysis based on Ochs and Capps narrative dimension of tellability can help us understand the answers to those questions.

Before proceeding with an application of an analysis of narrator ability based on Ochs and Capps' notion of tellability, here is a reminder of Ochs and Capps' description of tellability:

personal narratives vary in their quality as tellable accounts, that is, in the extent to which they convey a sequence of reportable events and make a point in a rhetorically effective



manner. Highly tellable narratives are of such interest that they can be told again and still be appreciated (33).

Thus, a narrative's tellability is made up of two main elements: reportable events and rhetorical skill. It is important to stress that whether or not events are reportable and whether or not the way in which they are told is skillful is gleaned by audience reaction to them. Ochs and Capps elaborate:

A highly tellable narrative of personal experience relates events of great interest or import to interlocutors. The events may be unknown to interlocutors. Or an unknown or known event may have bearing on their future lives, lending great value to the narrative account. In addition, a narrator may use rhetorical skills to transform even a seemingly prosaic incident into a highly tellable account. . . . Listeners and readers often evaluate narratives in these terms, judging whether the account is worth listening to, tedious, involving, and so on (34).

In other words, a highly tellable narrative would certainly combat the so what factor effectively. A low tellability narrative, on the other hand, is reluctantly launched, riddled with false starts, and has no clear sense of direction, and sometimes no resolution.

Within the Minnesota corpus there are three primary narrators: Martine, Evelyne and Christine. Generally speaking, Martine's narratives dominate the conversations. Of the 96 narratives told, Martine tells 46 of them (Evelyne tells 26, Christine tells 19, and Betsy tells 5). Additionally, Martine's narratives are generally on the high end of the tellability scale and Christine and Evelyne's narratives are on the lower end of the tellability scale. I

will illustrate these differences in tellability among the narrators with tellability analyses of the narratives "histoire-géographie, Christine", "histoire-géographie", and "le grec" (for the full texts of these narratives, see the Appendix).

In a conversation about studying for the baccalauréat, Christine launches "histoire-géographie, Christine", a narrative about her experience with her histoire-géographie exam. This narrative occurs just prior in the conversation to Martine's narrative "histoire-géographie", on the same topic. Following Martine's narrative comes "le grec", a narrative by Evelyne.

Starting with an analysis of Christine's narrative "histoire-géographie, Christine", I will show that while the events being narrated may be reportable, Christine fails to report them in a rhetorically effective manner, leading to a narrative that falls on the low end of the tellability spectrum. In lines 2-6 Christine starts her narrative. She signals her intent to tell a story by her introduction in line 2 (*moi je me souviens*). However, from the outset, Christine does not succeed in fully securing the attention of her conversational co-participants. Once she mentions l'histoire-géographie she is interrupted and has to make several attempts to regain the floor (lines 7-8, 10-11, and 13) before she is finally successful with her forceful utterance of *attends!* in line 15. Once Christine does manage to gain the floor her narrative lacks the

rhetorical skill necessary to keep her interlocutors interested. In continuing with her narrative Christine explains that she and her friend had decided to study for their exam. Christine had explained before the interruption in lines 7-13 that she and her friend were not gifted in *histoire-géographie*. In line 15 Christine emphasizes their intent to study by using both *réviser* and *bien travailler* and she also emphasizes the seriousness of the endeavor. This suggestion is responded to positively by Evelyne in line 16 (*c'est vrai!*). However, when Christine goes on to describe that instead of studying (which should have been easy since they forced themselves to meet at the academic environment of their high school), that she and her friend spent their time gazing at boys. Upon completing the description of what they had done, Christine breaks out into hysterical laughter. This is followed by laughter from Martine and Evelyne which Christine joins in with. Clearly, however, it is Christine who is getting the most amusement from this narrative. She goes on to give a few more details about how even after she and her friend go home to study they further avoided their task by making French toast. Again, Christine, who is laughing throughout the entire delivery of lines 25-28, seems to find her story to be extraordinarily funny where as Evelyne offers up what in contrast appears to be simply a polite chuckle in line 29. And the contribution of Martine at the end in line 33 is not

directed as feedback to Christine's story but represents instead the launching of her own narrative. You may recognize it as the first line in Martine's own narrative "histoire-géographie".

In comparing "histoire-géographie, Christine" with "histoire-géographie", it becomes clear what Ochs and Capps mean when they describe rhetorical skill as a necessary component of a highly tellable narrative. Let's look at some of the ways in which Christine's narrative contrasts with the one Martine tells directly following it. Perhaps the most noticeable difference is that Christine's narrative is much shorter in length. Martine utters 422 words during the course of her story about her histoire-géographie exam while Christine uses only 135 words in her narrative. And while length is not everything, Martine's extra almost 300 words allow her to narrate much more effectively. For instance, when looking at the motivation for concern over their respective upcoming exams, an element which is similar in both stories, there is tremendous difference. In Martine's story she describes her fear of the exam as follows: *en histoire-géo, euh, d'abord toute l'année, j'ai été la dernière* (lines 2-5); *toute l'année, j'ai été la dernière, j'avais 2, j'avais 4* (lines 7-10); *alors j'étais atroce!* (line 49); *c'est pas possible, une fille nulle en histoire-géographie, qui ne sait rien, alors j'ai pris mon amie, qui était la deuxième plus nulle de la classe* (lines 60-64). And these are merely the direct statements. In

Martine's narrative there is also the added information that she was so anxious about her inability in *histoire-géographie* that she was driven to lie to her father as well as her father's demand (revealed through reported speech) that she achieve at least the average. Again, it is not merely the quantity that matters but rather what Martine is able to accomplish with these statements. The drama-creating evaluative devices described by Labov and Polanyi constitute examples of rhetorical skill as conceived by Ochs and Capps. What leads to the determination that these devices are rhetorically effective is the way in which they are responded to by the interlocutors. While both Christine and Martine use evaluative devices, they do not use them equally and their use of them is not responded to equally by the conversational co-participants. It is these differences which lead to different determinations in the tellability of their narratives. Martine uses repetition to emphasize the importance of what she is saying in lines 4-5 and 6-7. Then once she has established the point of her ineptness, she illustrates this point with further evaluative devices to make the picture that much more vivid for her co-participants. She says that she received grades like 2 or 4 (lines 9-10) and she reveals through reported dialogue that her father would constantly ask her about her lesson thereby forcing her to lie (lines 11-14). The reported dialogue allows the co-participants to imagine what it

was like to have such a conversation with their father. Then later Martine returns to this same technique and again through reported speech reveals that her father has demanded that she achieve at least the average (lines 50-58). All of this contributes to the building of anticipation for the outcome. Therefore, the unexpected conclusion is that much more surprising when it is delivered, even despite the interlude where they discuss whether or not this exam was really oral. The level of detail that Martine includes in her story allows her audience to more fully participate in the interaction.

Christine's narrative, by contrast, does not engage her interlocutors in the same way. Christine merely states in line 6 (*l'histoire-géographie surtout parce qu'on était nulle*) the reasoning behind her and her friend's impetus to study. Consequently, although the narrative is obviously quite vivid for Christine (as seen by her copious laughter), she seems to fail to sufficiently translate the hilarity of the scenes she is describing for her co-participants. While Martine and Evelyne do laugh during Christine's narrative, their laughter seems to be polite and is certainly not as enthusiastic as the reactions to Martine's narration. As has been remarked by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Polanyi (1985), evaluation is most common and thereby most effective when it occurs at a point where the complication has

reached a maximum, just before the resolution. In this way the narrator is able to stress the point of the story. Martine accomplishes this with her many uses of evaluative techniques. However, Christine does not use such evaluation in her narrative. While not totally devoid of evaluation, the evaluation found in Christine's story is not sufficient in this context. Hers is a narrative that is often referred to in the vernacular as a situation where "you had to be there" to appreciate its importance. I would maintain that narratives that fall into this category are probably potentially entertaining narratives which unfortunately are being told by narrators who do not utilize for whatever reason all of the narrative devices which would make their narratives more rhetorically effective. In her book on the discourse of therapy, Ferrara (1994) also notes instances where narratives are not fully developed. In her example the narrator retold the narrative later in the corpus with more detail. She refers to the initial attempt as "a *potential* narrative, minus the so-called optional elements of abstract, orientation, evaluation, and coda" (63). She later says "occurring in the third taped session, one week after the second, the meager narrative is transformed into a full-blown narrative" (64). Unfortunately Christine does not exhibit a second telling of her narrative that is more effective. Therefore it can be seen only as a potentially highly tellable narrative.

A little later in the conversation Evelyne tells her own story about struggling with an exam on the baccalauréat only for her the difficult subject was Greek. Evelyne's narration has neither the reportable events nor the rhetorical skill necessary for a highly tellable narrative. In fact, Evelyne's narration exhibits all of the qualities of a narrative of low tellability. While Evelyne easily gains the floor for her narrative, once she has it she really does not have anything engaging to relay. Or perhaps like Christine's narrative there may be a potential narrative lurking in the shadows somewhere and Evelyne is just not capable of delivering it. About all Evelyne successfully reveals about her experience with taking a Greek class is that she hated it and did not do very well in it. This first point is heavily evaluated by Evelyne's repetition of the words *horrible* and *horreur*. In lines 16-19 (*alors le grec c'était horrible, je, j'avais horreur de ça, mais j'avais horreur horreur horreur de ça*) there are five repetitions of *horrible* or *horreur* and a sixth is added in line 22 (*c'était horrible*). Evelyne also remarks that she would become pale and timid when faced with this class. All of this seems like it should be orientation for the real point of the story, however, no real point ever surfaces. Johnstone (1990) states that someone who wants to take up time within a conversation by telling a narrative should have a point to what they are narrating.

Pointless stories are usually unacceptable in conversation, unless the teller is a child whose attempts to contribute are



being encouraged and humored; a person who tells a story without a point may, if the listeners are rude or childish or playful, be greeted with an unpleasant response like "So what?" or "Is that all you had to say?" Other audiences may respond with silence or a topic change which will feel awkward to all (30-31).

Luckily for Evelyne, Martine and Christine are not by this definition "rude or childish" however their lack of positive feedback does not encourage Evelyne to continue. Evelyne even seems somewhat confused as to what she wants to be saying. Her speech is riddled with false starts. This is especially evident in the section from lines 9-17. Evelyne just cannot seem to decide where she wants to go with this story. There are virtually no details for the co-participants to try to imagine what it was like for Evelyne. Instead of describing a specific uncomfortable incident in her Greek class, Evelyne keeps her narrative very vague. These features are the hallmarks of a low tellability narrative. Rather than using the rhetorically effective drama-creating evaluative techniques such as those suggested by both Labov and Polanyi, the devices used by Evelyne or rather the lack of devices used constitutes distance-creating evaluation. However, though the techniques used by Evelyne can definitely be described as distance-creating, I would suggest that it is not Evelyne's premeditated goal to use her discourse to create social distance between herself and her interlocutors. I feel as though any distance-creating devices that occur in Evelyne's speech are

unconsciously realized - it appears to be a personality trait that Evelyne has that does not allow herself to be able to articulate herself in the same rapport-building way that Martine does. If Evelyne's goal really was to create social distance between herself and the others, it seems unlikely that she would have launched her narrative in the first place. I believe that Evelyne simply is not a gifted narrator. She is certainly not a narrator who is capable of turning an account of relatively pedestrian events into something that is highly tellable. Also, while Evelyne does not display rapport-building in her own narratives, she does so in her role as co-teller by actively participating in the process of negotiation in the narratives which are told by the other participants in the conversations. This is in direct contrast to Martine's technique of recreating a scene through the use of reported speech as she did to recreate the pressure her father put on her to succeed. Although there is the sense that Evelyne also felt pressure during the situation she is describing, there is not a clear description of what was going on. Other than at the very beginning (lines 2, 6, and 8) before Evelyne really began to tell her narrative there is virtually no feedback of any kind to the narrative, either positive or negative.

In conclusion, the narrative dimension of tellability makes it possible to explore analyses of narrator effectiveness. In the examples that we looked at from the three narrators, we saw one

highly tellable narrative in "histoire-géographie" delivered by Martine, and two narratives that were low on the scale of tellability. While Christine's narrative seemed to contain reportable events, they were not delivered in a rhetorically effective manner as evidenced by the less than enthusiastic reactions of the interlocutors. Evelyne's narrative, on the other hand, failed the tellability test on both counts. There were neither reportable events nor rhetorically effective narration. In addition, there were false starts and no clear sense of direction or resolution in "le grec", clearly making it a narrative of low tellability. While from this initial analysis the hypothesis could be made that Martine is a more effective narrator than both Christine and Evelyne, to be able to evaluate with more assurance the abilities of these narrators, based on the tellability of their narratives, more of their narratives would have to be analyzed. Such a complete analysis goes beyond the scope of this dissertation, but is the type of study that Ochs and Capps' methodology encourages.

### **5.3.2 Intentional Fallacy in the Ochs and Capps Methodology**

One of the major ways in which Ochs and Capps' methodology differs from the structural approaches advocated by Labov and Polanyi is that its analyses are not contingent upon specific elements of structure. Rather, the narrative dimensions outlined by Ochs and Capps do not represent absolute narrative

qualities. It cannot be said of a narrative, for instance, that its moral stance is unequivocally certain. The possibilities within the narrative dimensions suggested by Ochs and Capps are designed to represent points on a continuum. Therefore, such possibilities are inherently open to interpretation and analytical conclusions cannot be thought of as precise. Such uncertainties with respect to the interpretation of a narrative are especially prevalent with the dimensions of moral stance and tellability.

Looking first at the dimension of moral stance, Ochs and Capps' description is filled with elements that can only be analyzed through judgement and inference:

Rooted in community and tradition, moral stance is a disposition towards what is good or valuable and how one ought to live in the world. Human beings judge themselves and others in relation to standards of goodness: they praise, blame, or otherwise hold people accountable for their comportment" (45).

In describing moral stance, Ochs and Capps suggest that the analyst must ascertain the moral positions of the participants vis-à-vis themselves and their fellow co-participants. Such positions can only be guessed at by the analyst and never completely accurately deduced as only each individual can know for certain to what extent statements that they make are indications of a moral point of view. Additionally, while it is true that human beings judge each other, it seems an impossible task for the analyst to ascertain without a doubt those judgements of praise and blame. I

should point out here that this criticism is perhaps a function of trying to apply a more ethnographic methodology to data for which I may not have enough information. In some cases the analyst may have much more information about the interlocutors gathered through participant observation or the analyst may be able to go back to the participants for follow-up interviews to inquire what their judgements may have been. In this way, determinations about moral stance may be more credible.

In explicating Ochs and Capps' notion of moral stance we looked at two narratives from the Minnesota corpus, "couscous" and "Nîmes" (for the full texts of these narratives, see the Appendix). In "couscous", I suggested that Martine uses this narrative to portray herself in a positive light, both as a gifted chef and as someone who goes above and beyond the call of duty for her students. However, because Martine never directly says something to the effect, "I'm telling this story to show you how good I am at cooking and how dedicated I am to my students", then such a suggestion on my part comes from subjective inferences and judgements that I made regarding elements of the narrative. For instance, I suggested that the following utterances by the co-participants were, while clearly jokes, also suggestions of their recognition of Martine's talent and determination as an amateur chef.

77 E: [vous pouvez prendre des  
photos!]

78 je ne vous inter[dis pas de prendre quelques  
photos]

80 C: [je signerai les autographes éventuellement]

77 E: [ you can take some  
pictures!]

78 I will not stop you[from taking a few pictures]

80 C: [I will be so kind as to sign autographs]

However, these statements could also be interpreted in another way. Perhaps Christine and Evelyne think that Martine is arrogant and ridiculous with respect to how she reacted when asked by the student for the recipe and are joking about her maliciously. Or perhaps there is a little of both of these sentiments in their comments. The only people who know the answers to these questions for sure are Christine and Evelyne. Therefore any conclusions drawn by an analyst are speculative.

In another example from this narrative, Martine reports her student as saying that her father was struck by the idea of Martine coming to their home to teach them how to prepare couscous.

128 Papa est très impressionné par l'idée d'un  
professeur

129 de français qui va venir à la maison

128            Papa is quite struck by the idea of a French

129            professor who is going to come to the house

I suggested above that this comment by the student's father was an indicator of the fact that such an offer by Martine was truly above and beyond the call of duty for a teacher. Again, perhaps this is not the idea that Martine was trying to convey. Maybe she wanted to portray the father as being as culinarily naïve as the student, suggesting instead that he was surprised not that Martine would come to their home, but that she would come for the purpose of a culinary demonstration. Again, only Martine knows the answer to this question, as only the father knows the intentions of his remarks that were relayed by his daughter to Martine. These are issues that remain ultimately unknowable and can only be guessed at by an analyst.

There are also similar problems with Ochs and Capps' dimension of tellability. Before proceeding to a discussion of the concept of tellability I would first like to point out some similarities between tellability and the notion of narrativity. The field of narratology has had as one of its goals the definition of a set of features that all narratives share. The term "narrativity" has been used to describe the combination of special qualities that constitute narrative. In this way a narrative may be seen as high

or low in narrativity. Prince (1982, 1991) has suggested that a narrative's narrativity is founded on the following four features:

1. events that are non-trivial, discrete, specific and relevant to humans;
2. conflict between two opposites or adversaries;
3. a beginning, a middle, and an end;
4. an audience that recognizes the text as narrative.

There are, however, problems with the notion of narrativity. While this notion seems to be central to narrative function it is difficult to make it concrete. If a narrative is low in narrativity does that mean that all four of the features described by Prince are not present? If one of the features is not present in a given text, does that mean that that text cannot be considered a narrative?

Narrativity is similar to the construct of tellability as proposed by Ochs and Capps (2001), and consequently has similar problems. Ochs and Capps describe tellability in the following way.

personal narratives vary in their quality as tellable accounts, that is, in the extent to which they convey a sequence of reportable events and make a point in a rhetorically effective manner. Highly tellable narratives are of such interest that they can be told again and still be appreciated (33).

For the dimension of tellability the range of possibilities goes from high to low, just as with narrativity. Ochs and Capps (2001) suggest that narratives which are low on the tellability scale have



been less studied by narrative analysts. However, tellability is a concept that cannot be specifically defined based on the presence or absence of certain narrative elements. Ochs and Capps suggest that what makes a narrative high on the scale of tellability is either the sensational nature of the events being narrated or the significance of the events being narrated to the conversational participants. However, this notion of tellability raises many questions. For instance, how can something be inherently tellable? Is not a narrative's tellability linked to the specific context of the interaction? What may be tellable to one audience may not be to another. Or is it possible for a narrative to be highly tellable from the perspective of the narrator but not so from the perspective of the audience? If this is the case, how should the narrative be classified? It seems as though the designation of a narrative as either high or low on the scale of tellability is a judgement that can be arrived at based only on the subjective opinions of the analyst. It seems very possible that a narrative presented for review to a variety of narrative analysts may come back with values for tellability that are not consistent.

Recall that above in the discussion of tellability I suggested that on two instances of launching a parallel story episode ("le grec" and "la soupe") Evelyne tells a narrative of low tellability. It was my suggestion that these narratives were low in tellability

because Evelyne seemed to be coaxed into telling them to complete the parallel story episodes created by Martine and Christine. In their description, Ochs and Capps suggest that low tellability narratives can result when a narrative is elicited, such as when a parent asks their child to report about their day at school. In Evelyne's case her narratives are not directly elicited, but it can be argued that she may have felt compelled to tell them to complete the parallel story episode. Evelyne could have simply decided not to add a parallel story of her own in either of these cases. However, something caused her to make the active decision to launch each of these narratives. It does seem evident that they are both narratives that are disorganized and incoherent and are definitely not "of such interest that they can be told again and still be appreciated". Specifically, they are not told "in a rhetorically effective manner". However, despite this assessment, one must also consider the fact that because these two narratives are told as part of a parallel story episode, it would also seem as though they would qualify as being significant to the conversational co-participants, a criterion for high tellability. Thus the analyst is put into a position of trying to determine which element of tellability is more important in assigning a tellability designation to a given narrative. Is it more important for a narrative to be told about sensational events and "in a rhetorically effective manner" or for a

narrative to be significant to the conversational participants. Must all of these conditions be met in order to consider a narrative to be of high tellability? Because tellability is so subjective, these questions will always come up in the analysis of a given set of data.

It should be pointed out that moral stance and tellability are just the two dimensions that most clearly present analyses that are open to interpretation. However, this possibility exists with the other dimensions as well. I will conclude by giving one more example from the dimension of tellership. I noted earlier in the explication of the notion of tellership that there are occasions in "Orégon" where the conversational co-participants initiate co-telling by asking questions of the narrator, questions that either demand clarification of the events being narrated or questions that suggest disagreement with the narrator. Ochs and Capps suggest that "the dimension of *tellership* refers to the extent and kind of involvement of conversational partners in the actual recounting of a narrative" (24). An approach such as the one suggested by Ochs and Capps necessitates that the analyst guess at the intent of contributions by the co-participants in order to arrive at a conclusion on the "kind" of involvement at issue. In my above analysis I suggested that Christine's questioning of Martine could be interpreted as a challenge to Martine and her husband's decision to abandon their tent. I go on to interpret the responses both by Martine and the

other co-participants. In trying to determine where on the continuum of a particular narrative dimension a particular narrative falls, such judgements of the intentions of the participants become unavoidable. A methodology that requires the analyst to make such subjective judgements is therefore weakened because such judgments can always be challenged by others.

#### **5.4 CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the methodology suggested by Ochs and Capps contains both more promise and more problems. Of the three methodologies, it is the best at handling conversational narrative data such as that contained in the Minnesota corpus. The narrative data can be represented in a way that shows, as much as is possible, how the narrative unfolded by accommodating the inclusion of such features as overlap. Perhaps the largest benefit of Ochs and Capps' methodology is that it allows for both participant focused and content driven analyses. Where Labov and Polanyi restrict their analyses to the contribution of the narrator, Ochs and Capps' approach makes an analysis dependent on narrator-interlocutor interaction possible. On the other hand, though, the narrative dimensions suggested by Ochs and Capps are not structurally defined and therefore are open to analyst interpretation. Because the analyses are based on judgement they remain contestable leaving the entire methodology subject to

criticism. Such criticism is not a likely when the analyses are based on ethnographically collected data as is the case for Ochs and Capps. However, this issue remains very real when attempting to apply this methodology to a data set for which not as much is known about the specific participants and the specific context of the conversations.

## **Chapter 6: Conclusion**

In an attempt to understand how to best analyze the conversational narrative data contained within the Minnesota corpus, I have undertaken a meta-analysis of different narrative analysis methodologies of the last few decades. Conversational narrative was first a subject of analysis in the late 60's when Labov and Waletzky, working under the influence of the era of structuralism, decided that in order to better understand narrative, one must understand its most basic form which they felt resided in oral versions of personal experience. Since their groundbreaking 1967 study, the field of narrative analysis has been dominated by structural approaches to narrative that seek to define the structural components of a narrative and formulate an analysis based on these components. Only recently with the introduction of Ochs and Capps' methodology in 2001 has an alternative which values both the context and the interactive nature of narrative and seeks to describe the co-participant's influences on narrative been put forth. I have suggested that the structural map against which narrative data has been viewed has led to results that are skewed and incomplete. As I have pointed out, while cartographers know the differences between different types of maps and the different and yet equally valid analyses that

can result from using them, narratologists have for the most part been using only one type of map to view and analyze all narrative data. This meta-analysis has suggested that there are positive and negative qualities to each of the methodologies at issue and that different methodologies are more or less appropriate for different types of data. While the structural approaches to conversational narrative suggested by Labov and Polanyi do not provide an adequate means to analyze interactive narratives, Ochs and Capps' methodology requires more extensive ethnographic information than what I had available with the data in the Minnesota corpus. That being said, each of the three methodologies has taught me a new way to view the data and has in turn led me to a more complete understanding of the data. I could not have arrived at such an understanding of the data without having tried to apply each methodology to them.

The Labovian methodology was developed to deal with elicited narrative data collected within the framework of the sociolinguistic interview. While the goal of these elicitations was to simulate conversational narrative, the data upon which the methodology was created had little to no interaction. Therefore, because the methodology was not really designed to accommodate interactive narrative, several problems arise. I have shown that within the Labovian framework it is impossible to represent speech

into audibly distinct breath groups, meaning also that overlap cannot be represented and that any audience contribution is ignored. I have also demonstrated that because Labov did not use any interactive data and was not interested in the surface interactive structure of narrative, but rather only on the deep structure or iconic sequence, that many clauses which the Labovian methodology would consider to be free such as responses to questions or statements and repetitions are not really free and pose a problem when applying the methodology to interactive narrative data. I have also suggested that basing narrative analysis on the idea of iconic sequence is flawed because a narrator chooses which events to portray and which events to leave out in any given narrative. Thus, any narrative is inherently skewed by the narrator's perspective and therefore is not a representation of reality as it occurred. I also questioned the Labovian requirement of temporal juncture in narrative. I showed how such a requirement leads to the exclusion of data that fulfill both the referential and evaluative functions of narrative. I claimed that temporal juncture should be seen as an element that is usually present but whose absence should not in and of itself be used as a reason to exclude certain data. Finally, I propose several modifications to the important Labovian notion of evaluation. I noted the difficulties in defining evaluation, because since



everything that the narrator chooses to include in his or her narrative can be considered to be evaluative. At the very least, I suggested that evaluation must include both drama-creating and distance-creating evaluation. I claimed that the most serious problem with the Labovian notion of evaluation is that it is devised without any reference to how the audience is receiving it. The Labovian methodology indicates that a narrator must use evaluation to make their narrative appear more vivid and real. The implication in this statement is that it must appear this way to the audience of the narrative. Any narrator must constantly ward off the dreaded "So what?" question. I have termed this the so what factor and have suggested that through an analysis of audience reaction to narrative that a truer picture of how effective the evaluation in a narrative really is can be realized.

Even though the Polanyian methodology provides the narrative analyst with more tools with which to analyze narratives than does the Labovian methodology, it still does not succeed both in its own goal of producing an Adequate Paraphrase and in its ability to describe the interactional component of conversational narrative. The application of the Polanyian methodology transforms the narrative text into something that is unrecognizable as the original narrative and is difficult to work with. I have suggested that Polanyi's definition of an independent clause is too

broad in its inclusion of unfinished phrases, hesitations, repetitions, and false starts. Not only does such a division fail to lead to a better understanding of the narrative, but it also creates problems in categorizing clauses that do not have enough semantic material. I also state that the same is true for the step in Polanyi's methodology for transforming narrative clauses into propositions. These difficulties are evident in Polanyi's own non-use of her methodology with her more interactive data. I have also shown that there are significant problems with Polanyi's notion of the Adequate Paraphrase. Because in the creation of the Adequate Paraphrase only Storyworld clauses are considered, the result tells the analyst nothing about how the narrative is being received and thus does not address the so what factor. Additionally, I point out that the methodology for creating the Adequate Paraphrase does not seem to work. When applied to data from the Minnesota corpus, the methodology led to the exclusion of seemingly essential clauses as well as the inclusion of clauses that seemed more marginal. Finally, as a way to improve the Polanyian methodology, I suggested that an analysis of a narrative's Non-Storyworld clauses would considerably strengthen its usefulness, allowing the analyst important insights into the nature of narrative interaction and into how narratives are received by the conversational co-participants. I put this suggestion to the test by analyzing the

Non-Storyworld clauses of three narratives from the Minnesota corpus. I hypothesized that a successful narrative would include at least as many or more Non-Storyworld clauses from the recipients than from the narrator (after discarding Neutral Non-Storyworld clauses and subtracting out any negative clauses). Upon completing this analysis I found that such a quantitative study alone was inadequate to understand the nature of the interaction in the narratives and to better comprehend the narratives I followed up with an evaluation of the content of the Non-Storyworld clauses. I found that issues such as attempts by the narrator to retrieve specific, seemingly non-essential pieces of information, recipient interjections that steer the conversation off of the course of the narrative, as well as imbalances in the quality of responses such as laughter can all give a false impression of the type of feedback that was received during the course of a narrative. I postulated that in order to arrive at a superior analysis of a narrative that a combination of a quantitative analysis as well as an analysis of the semantic content of a narrative must be undertaken. Doing the quantitative analysis steers the analyst towards those elements of a narrative that merit closer inspection. Once this has been accomplished the analyst can arrive at a more complete understanding of the interactive elements of

conversational narrative and how interaction effects the course and the result of a narrative.

The methodology proposed by Ochs and Capps presented an ethnographically based approach that solved many of the drawbacks of the more structural approaches suggested by Labov and Polanyi and yet new and different difficulties surfaced. I concluded that the major benefits of Ochs and Capps' methodology were that it was specifically designed for the interactive conversational narratives of the type which make up my data. Additionally, the integrity of the discourse can be maintained and I was able to use my transcriptions unaltered. Another important benefit of this methodology was that it allowed me to discuss the content of a narrative through reference to the five narrative dimensions. Specifically, audience reaction, which was wholly left out of the Labovian and Polanyian analyses, has a place in Ochs and Capps' methodology. I proposed that an analysis based on Ochs and Capps' narrative dimension of tellability can help us understand the differences between different narrators by looking at the audience's reactions to their narratives and then to ultimately evaluate narrator effectiveness. I undertook an analysis of tellability on a narrative from each of the three narrators in the corpus and I have made the hypothesis based on the results of that analysis that Martine is a more effective narrator than

Christine or Evelyne. I suggested that more complete analyses of this type are encouraged by Ochs and Capps' methodology. On the other hand, I noted that because the narrative dimensions outlined by Ochs and Capps are not dependent upon specific elements of structure and that the possibilities within each narrative dimension represent points on a continuum and not absolute values, then the resulting possibilities are inherently subject to interpretation. I suggested that the dimensions of moral stance and tellability were the most vulnerable to criticism. With regard to moral stance I stated that the analyst is put into the position of having to ascertain the moral positions of the interlocutors. I showed examples of possible alternative interpretations of "couscous" and suggested that any analysis of the moral stance of the narrative was ultimately speculative. I also questioned Ochs and Capps' claim that a narrative can be inherently tellable and stated that an analyst's designation of a narrative as either high or low on the scale of tellability can be seen as a subjective decision. I noted that this is especially true when the analyst must decide which elements of tellability are more important in classifying a narrative such as must be done in "le grec" and "soupe". I also questioned the requirement of the analyst to judge the intent behind co-participant contributions in determining a narrative's tellership.

While the Ochs and Capps' methodology seems to be the best suited for the type of data at issue in the Minnesota corpus, there are also clear benefits to be derived from applying a more structural approach. Specifically, an analysis of the Polanyi defined Non-Storyworld clauses in a narrative seems to provide some real results in coming up with some answers to the so what factor, whose importance was implied but not addressed by both Labov and Polanyi. I suggest that a combination of elements from both structural and ethnographic approaches provides a more complete methodology with which to analyze interactive narrative data.

I should note that the biggest limitation of my study stemmed from my lack of more extensive, ethnographic information about the context of the discourse. Such information, if it had been available, would have significantly strengthened the credibility of my analyses. There are many opportunities to explore the narrative dimensions suggested by Ochs and Capps in more detail with ethnographically collected data. I also feel as though more efforts could be made to combine quantitative and qualitative analyses to interactive narrative to arrive at a better understanding both of narrative structure and content.

## Appendix 1 Participant Questionnaires

TO: Participants in tape recordings

FROM: Betsy Barnes

Thank you again for your participation. I'm a little late getting around to this, but I should get a little biographical information from each of you. Would you please take a moment to fill out the following questionnaire and return it to me. Merci beaucoup!

1. Nom: *Evelyne*

2. Age: *27*

3. Lieu de naissance: *BOURGES*

D'autres lieux de residence, avec ages approximatifs:  
(jusqu'au present) *TOURS, POITIER*

4. Langue maternelle: *français*

D'autres langues apprises, a quel age? *Latin, 12 ans*

D'autres langues que le francais parlees chez vous pendant votre enfance:

5. Profession de vos parents: Mere: *sans*

Pere: *industriel*

6. A quelle classe sociale considerez-vous que votre famille (vos parents) appartient? (hautes classes, classes moyennes/superieures/inferieures, classe ouvriere)

*entre la classe moyenne et superieure*

7. Etudes que vous avez faites, et que vous faites maintenant:

*Histoire*

*Histoire de l'art*

*Litterature française*



TO: Participants in tape recordings

FROM: Betsy Barnes

Thank you again for your participation. I'm a little late getting around to this, but I should get a little biographical information from each of you. Would you please take a moment to fill out the following questionnaire and return it to me. Merci beaucoup!

1. Nom: *Christine*
2. Age: *21*
3. Lieu de naissance: *Saint-Denis, FRANCE*

D'autres lieux de residence, avec ages approximatifs:

(jusqu'au present)

*St Remy, Saint-Denis*

4. Langue maternelle: *Français*

D'autres langues apprises, a quel age?

*Anglais, 11 ans*

*Allemand, 13 ans*

*Espagnol, 15 ans*

*Chinois, 17 ans*

D'autres langues que le francais parrees chez vous pendant votre enfance:

5. Profession de vos parents:      Mere: *employée de bureau*  
Pere: *en invalidité*

6. A quelle classe sociale considerez-vous que votre famille (vos parents) appartient? (hautes classes, classes moyennes/supérieures/inferieures, classe ouvrière)

*classe ouvrière*

7. Etudes que vous avez faites, et que vous faites maintenant:

*Lycée - Terminale A5 (3 langues)*

*Etudes universitaires - Langues Orientales (chinois)*

*Littérature comparée (U of M.)*

TO: Participants in tape recordings

FROM: Betsy Barnes

Thank you again for your participation. I'm a little late getting around to this, but I should get a little biographical information from each of you. Would you please take a moment to fill out the following questionnaire and return it to me. Merci beaucoup!

1. Nom: *Martine*

2. Age: *24*

3. Lieu de naissance: *Algiers (Algeria)*

D'autres lieux de residence, avec ages approximatifs:

(jusqu'au present)

*Moved to France when I was 7 years old*

*Moved to the U.S. at 21 years old*

4. Langue maternelle: *French/Arabic*

D'autres langues apprises, a quel age?

*English, 11 years old, 7 years High school*

*German, 14 years old, 5 years High school*

*Spanish, 16 years old, 3 years High school*

*Portuguese, 18 years old, 2 years U of Montpellier*

D'autres langues que le francais parrees chez vous pendant votre enfance: *oui, Arabe.*

5. Profession de vos parents: Mere: *Docteur*

Pere: *censeur*

6. A quelle classe sociale considerez-vous que votre famille (vos parents) appartient? (hautes classes, classes moyennes/superieures/inferieures, classe ouvriere)

*classe moyenne superieure*

7. Etudes que vous avez faites, et que vous faites maintenant:

*B.A. English Litt, civilization, language*

*M.A. English*

*Working on a M.A. in French*

*Possibly a P.H.D in comp Lit.*

## **Appendix 2 "Orégon"**

### "Orégon", Interactive Representation

- 1 M.: oui oui bien sûr euh  
2 c'était un voyage dans l'ouest  
3 et on était dans euh  
4 je crois que c'était l'Orégon  
5 y a des ours  
6 là-bas  
7 en Orégon?
- 8 B.: oh oui
- 9 M.: oui c'est ça c'était l'Orégon!  
10 et euh  
11 on faisait du camping  
12 et sur toutes les tables  
13 il y avait écrit euh  
14 "éloignez la nourriture mettez-la dans la voiture  
et la voiture  
15 loin de la tente des ours les ours attaquent!"
- 16 B.,E.: [ (laughter) ]
- 17 C.: [c'est sympathique hein!]

18 M: [on était on était ]  
 19 dans un trou  
 20 y avait des des des de des genres de de  
 montagne tout autour  
 21 et alors  
 22 ça attaque  
 23 et pis euh bon on s'en va le lendemain parce  
 qu'on restait jamais plus d'un jour dans le même  
 endroit c'était un voyage  
 24 on arrive un moment dans un genre de forêt  
 dense  
 25 en pleine nuit  
 26 c'était vraiment impressionnant  
 27 bon on plante la tente euh  
 28 on joue au  
 29 à avec la lampe-là  
 30 on joue au  
 31 au c'est pas aux échecs c'est  
 32 manger les dames là  
 33 les pions  
 34 B.: les [dames? ]  
 35 M: [au black] gammon backgammon  
 36 C: au ja[quet! ]  
 37 M: [je sais] pas comment [on dit en français]

38 E: [au jacquet! ]  
 39 M: c'est au jacquet  
 40 ah on joue au jacquet  
 41 et euh  
 42 tout d'un coup  
 43 contre la tente y a quelque chose là qui passe à  
 toute vitesse!  
 44 ? : (laughter)  
 45 M: je t'assure!  
 46 qui qui [frôle la ] tente  
 47 ? : [(laughter)]  
 48 M: alors Bill il fait:  
 49 "who's out there?"  
 50 All: (laughter)  
 51 M: et puis il me dit  
 52 "Martine! mes lu[nettes!"]  
 53 E: [ pro]tecteur de sa femme!  
 54 C,B: [ (laughter) ]  
 55 M: [oui attends]  
 56 alors il dit ["Martine mes lunettes!"]  
 57 All: [ (laughter) ]  
 58 M: mais moi je me dis mais qu'est-ce que c'est  
 imbécile

59 il me dit "mes lunettes!" maintenant il est ceux  
qui vont nous attaquer ils savent qu'il voit rien

60 All: (loud laughter)

61 M: non mais on était en pleine nuit

62 et puis en forêt dense

63 et il me dit "mes lunettes!"

64 [oh (inaudible) qui avait frôlé la tente alors moi  
paralysée qui qui réagissait]

65 All: [ (laughter) ]

66 M: parce que j'ai dit ça y est là

67 on va nous tomber dessus

68 (laughter)

69 [c'est la fin et puis euh bon]

70 All: [ (laughter) ]

71 M: [je trouve ses lunettes]

72 E: [qu'est-ce que  
]tu es ridicule d'avoir dit ça!

73 M: et euh

74 après après

75 il est sorti avec la lampe

76 et il est cherché

77 rien

78 bon

79 au bout d'un moment euh



80 on a fini le jeu n'est-ce pas  
81 on on on se couche donc euh  
82 on va presque s'endormir  
83 quand on entend  
84 (makes sound of footsteps)  
85 dans les feuilles de la forêt  
86 qui venaient  
87 C: [oui]  
88 M: [qui ] venaient en face de nous  
89 c'était évident  
90 des pas  
91 on aurait dit des pas d'humains  
92 eh ben je t'assure on est sorti on a plié la tente  
on a passé la nuit dans la voiture  
93 C: et vous avez vu ce que c'était?  
94 M: on est parti à deux heures  
95 non on n'a rien vu  
96 on a vu une petite de rien du tout comme une  
grosse souris  
97 E: [ (laughter) ]  
98 C: [tu crois que c'était un ours?]  
99 M: [ben Bill il dit que c'était  
un ours probablement on était on était dans on était  
dans]

100 ? [ (inaudible)  
 ]

101 M: la région des ours

102 C: oh dis donc

103 B: oh oui! c'est

104 ça peut être

105 vraiment dangereux

106 M: ah oui! oui ça peut être très dangereux c'est  
 pour ça ils sont beaux sur les photos

107 C: oui mais ils attaquent pas euh

108 [sans motif en général]

109 M: [ (inaudible) ]

110 B: en général mais

111 C: mais si ils ont très faim euh

112 hein?

113 M: et oui

114 [mais alors il faudrait]

115 ? [ (inaudible) ]

116 M: les les les les ours de la région de l'Orégon là où  
 il fait froid tout ça

117 bon ils ont faim hein!

"Oregon", Interactive Representation, translation

1 M.: yes yes of course uh  
2 it was a trip west  
3 and we were in uh  
4 I think that it was Oregon  
5 are there bears  
6 there  
7 in Oregon?  
8 B.: oh yes  
9 M.: yes that's it it was Oregon!  
10 and uh  
11 we were camping  
12 and on all the tables  
13 it was written uh  
14 "keep food away put it in the car and the car  
15 far from the tent bears bears attack!"  
16 B.,E.: [ (laughter) ]  
17 C.: [ oh that's nice! ]  
18 M: [we were we were]  
19 in a valley  
20 there were some some some some sort of  
mountains all around  
21 and so  
22 they attack

23           and then uh so we left the next day because we  
              never stayed more than one day in the same  
              place it was a trip  
 24           at one point we arrived in a very thick forest  
 25           in the middle of the night  
 26           it was truly remarkable  
 27           so we pitch our tent uh  
 28           we play  
 29           in in the lantern light  
 30           we play  
 31           it isn't checkers it's  
 32           take the pieces  
 33           the pieces  
 34    B.:    the [women?]  
 35    M:       [ black ] gammon backgammon  
 36    C:    ja[quet! ]  
 37    M:       [I don't] know how[to say it in French]  
 38    E:                           [    jacquet!        ]  
 39    M:    it's jaquet  
 40           ah we are playing jacquet  
 41           and uh  
 42           all of a sudden  
 43           against the tent there was something there that  
              was going by quickly!

44     ?:     (laughter)  
 45     M:     I assure you!  
 46             that that [brushed the] tent  
 47     ?:             [ (laughter) ]  
 48     M:     so Bill he goes:  
 49             "who's out there?"  
 50     All:    (laughter)  
 51     M:     and then he tells me  
 52             "Martine! my [glasses!]"  
 53     E:             [        pro]tecting his wife!  
 54     C,B:   [ (laughter) ]  
 55     M:     [yes wait]  
 56             so he says ["Martine my glasses!"]  
 57     All:             [        (laughter)        ]  
 58     M:     but I say to myself who is this imbecile  
 59             saying to me "my glasses!" now whatever is going  
            to attack us doesn't know that he can't see  
 60     All:    (loud laughter)  
 61     M:     no but we were in the middle of the night  
 62             and also in a thick forest  
 63             and he says to me "my glasses!"  
 64             [oh (inaudible) who had brushed the tent so me  
            paralysed who was reacting]

65 All: [ (laughter) ]  
66 M: because I said this is it  
67 it's going to come down on us  
68 (laughter)  
69 [this is the end and then uh so]  
70 All: [ (laughter) ]  
71 M: [I find his glasses]  
72 E: [how  
ridiculous you are to have said that!]  
73 M: and uh  
74 after after  
75 he left with the lantern  
76 and he looked  
77 nothing  
78 so  
79 after a moment uh  
80 we finished the game right  
81 we we we go to sleep therefore uh  
82 we are almost asleep  
83 when we hear  
84 (makes sound of footsteps)  
85 in the leaves of the forest  
86 which are coming

87 C: [ yes ]  
 88 M: [which] are coming towards us  
 89 it was clearly  
 90 footsteps  
 91 one would have said human steps  
 92 and so I assure you we left we folded the tent we  
 spent the night in the car  
 93 C: and did you see what it was?  
 94 M: we left at two o'clock  
 95 no we didn't see anything  
 96 we saw a little something like a big mouse  
 97 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 98 C: [do you think that it was a bear?]  
 99 M: [well Bill says that it  
 was probably a bear we were in the we were in]  
 100 ? [(inaudible)]  
 101 M: the region of bears  
 102 C: oh really  
 103 B: oh yes! it's  
 104 it can be  
 105 truly dangerous  
 106 M: ah yes! yes it can be very dangerous and it's for  
 that reason that they are beautiful in pictures  
 107 C: yes but they don't attack uh

108 [without a motive for the most part]  
 109 M: [ (inaudible) ]  
 110 B: for the most part but  
 111 C: but if they are very hungry  
 112 huh?  
 113 M: why yes  
 114 [but then it must be]  
 115 ? [ (inaudible) ]  
 116 M: the the the the bears in Oregon there where it is  
 cold and all  
 117 well they are hungry huh!

Labovian framework of "Oregon"

a oui oui bien sûr euh c'était un voyage dans  
 l'ouest  
 b et on était dans euh je crois que c'était l'Orégon  
 c y a des ours là-bas en Orégon ?  
 C oh oui  
 d oui c'est ça c'était l'Orégon !  
 e et euh on faisait du camping  
 f et sur toutes les tables il y avait écrit euh  
 « éloignez la nourriture mettez-la dans la voiture  
 loin de la tente des ours les ours attaquent ! »  
 F [laughter]  
 F [c'est sympathique hein !]



g [on était on était] dans un trou

h y avait des des des de des genres de de  
montagnes tout autour

i et alors ça attaque

j et pis euh bon on s'en va le lendemain parce  
qu'on restait jamais plus d'un jour dans le même  
endroit c'était un voyage

k on arrive un moment dans un genre de forêt  
dense en pleine nuit

l c'était vraiment impressionnant

m bon on plante la tente euh

n on joue au à avec la lampe-là

o on joue au au c'est pas aux échecs c'est manger  
les dames là les pions

O les [dames ?]

p [au black] gammon backgammon

P au ja[quet!]

q [je sais] pas comment [on dit en français]

Q [au jaquet !]

r c'est au jaquet

s ah on joue au jaquet

t et euh tout d'un coup contre la tente y a quelque  
chose là qui passe à toute vitesse !

T (laughter)

u je t'assure !

v qui qui [frôle la] tente  
 V [(laughter)]  
 w alors Bill il fait « who's out there ? »  
 W (laughter)  
 x et puis il me dit « Martine ! mes lu[nettes ! »]  
 X [pro]tecteur de  
 sa femme !  
 X [(laughter)]  
 x [oui attends]  
 y alors il dit ["Martine mes lunettes!"]  
 Y [(laughter)]  
 z mais moi je me dis mais qu'est-ce que c'est  
 imbécile il me dit « mes lunettes ! » maintenant il  
 est ceux qui vont nous attaquer ils savent qu'il  
 voit rien  
 Z (loud laughter)  
 aa non mais on était en pleine nuit  
 bb et puis en forêt dense  
 cc et il me dit « mes lunettes ! »  
 dd [oh (inaudible) qui avait frôlé la tente alors moi  
 paralysée qui qui réagissait]  
 DD [ (laughter)]  
 ee parce que j'ai dit ça y est là  
 ff on va nous tomber dessus

FF	(laughter)
gg	[c'est la fin et puis euh bon]
GG	[(laughter)]
hh	[je trouve ses lunettes]
II dit ça !	[qu'est-ce que] tu es ridicule d'avoir
jj	et euh après après il est sorti avec la lampe
kk	et il est cherché
ll	rien
mm	bon au bout d'un moment euh on a fini le jeu n'est-ce pas
nn	on on on se couche donc euh
oo	on va presque s'endormir
pp	quand on entend (makes sound of footsteps) dans les feuilles de la forêt
qq	qui venaient
QQ	[oui]
rr	[qui] venaient en face de nous
ss	c'était évident des pas
tt	on aurait dit des pas d'humains
uu	eh ben je t'assure on est sorti on a plié la tente on a passé la nuit dans la voiture
UU	et vous avez vu ce que c'était ?
vv	on est parti à deux heures

ww	non on n'a rien vu
xx	on a vu une petite de rien du tout comme une grosse souris
XX	[(laughter)]
XX	[tu crois que c'était un ours ?]
yy	[ben Bill il dit que c'était un ours probablement on était dans on était dans] la région des ours
YY	[ (inaudible) ]
YY	oh dis donc
ZZ	oh oui ! c'est ça peut être vraiment dangereux
aaa	ah oui ! oui ça peut être très dangereux
bbb	c'est pour ça ils sont beaux sur les photos
CCC	oui mais ils attaquent pas euh [sans motif en général]
ccc	[ (inaudible)]
CCC	en général mais
DDD	mais si ils ont très faim euh hein ?
ddd	et oui
eee	[mais alors il faudrait]
EEE	[(inaudible)]
ggg	les les les les ours de la région de l'Orégon là où il fait froid tout ça bon ils ont faim hein !

### **Division of "Orégon" into Polanyian independent clauses**

1      oui oui bien sûr euh  
2      c'était un voyage dans l'ouest  
3      et on était dans  
4      euh  
5      je crois  
6      que c'était l'Orégon  
7      y a des ours là-bas en Orégon?  
8      oh oui  
9      oui  
10     c'est ça  
11     c'était l'Orégon!  
12     et euh  
13     on faisait du camping  
14     et sur toutes les tables il y avait écrit  
15     euh  
16     "éloignez la nourriture  
17     mettez-la dans la voiture et la voiture loin de la tente  
18     des ours  
19     les ours attaquent!"  
20     (laughter)  
21     c'est sympathique  
22     hein!

23 on était  
24 on était dans un trou  
25 y avait des  
26 des  
27 des  
28 de  
29 des genres de  
30 de montagnes tout autour  
31 et alors  
32 ça attaque  
33 et pis euh bon  
34 on s'en va le lendemain  
35 parce qu'on restait jamais plus d'un jour dans le même  
endroit  
36 c'était un voyage  
37 on arrive un moment dans un genre de forêt dense en  
pleine nuit  
38 c'était vraiment impressionnant  
39 bon  
40 on plante la tente  
41 euh  
42 on joue au  
43 à

44 avec la lampe-là  
45 on joue au  
46 au  
47 c'est pas aux échecs  
48 c'est manger les dames là  
49 les pions  
50 les dames?  
51 au black gammon  
52 backgammon  
53 au jacquet!  
54 je sais pas comment  
55 on dit en français  
56 au jacquet!  
57 c'est au jacquet  
58 ah  
59 on joue au jacquet  
60 et euh  
61 tout d'un coup contre la tente y a quelque chose là  
62 qui passe à toute vitesse!  
63 (laughter)  
64 je t'assure!  
65 qui

66 qui frôle la tente  
67 (laughter)  
68 alors  
69 Bill il fait  
70 "who's out there?"  
71 (laughter)  
72 et puis  
73 he says to me  
74 "Martine! my glasses!  
75 protecting his wife!  
76 (laughter)  
77 yes  
78 wait  
79 so  
80 he says  
81 "Martine my glasses!"  
82 (laughter)  
83 but  
84 I say to myself  
85 who is this imbecile  
86 saying to me  
87 "my glasses!"



88 now he is  
89 whoever is going to attack us  
90 they don't know  
91 that he can't see anything  
92 (loud laughter)  
93 no  
94 but  
95 we were in the middle of the night and also in a thick  
forest  
96 and he's saying to me  
97 "my glasses!"  
98 oh  
99 (inaudible)  
100 who had brushed the tent  
101 alors  
102 moi paralysée  
103 qui  
104 qui réagissait  
105 (laughter)  
106 parce que j'ai dit  
107 ça y est là  
108 on va nous tomber dessus  
109 (laughter)

110 c'est la fin  
111 et puis euh bon  
112 (laughter)  
113 je trouve ses lunettes  
114 qu'est-ce que tu es ridicule  
115 d'avoir dit ça!  
116 et euh  
117 après  
118 après il est sorti avec la lampe  
119 et il est cherché  
120 rien  
121 bon  
122 au bout d'un moment  
123 euh  
124 on a fini le jeu  
125 n'est-ce pas  
126 on  
127 on  
128 on se couche donc  
129 euh  
130 on va presque s'endormir  
131 quand on entend

132 (makes the sound of footsteps)  
133 dans les feuilles de la forêt  
134 qui venaient  
135 oui  
136 qui venaient en face de nous  
137 c'était évident des pas  
138 on aurait dit des pas d'humains  
139 eh ben je t'assure  
140 on est sorti  
141 on a plié la tente  
142 on a passé la nuit dans la voiture  
143 et vous avez vu ce que c'était?  
144 on est parti à deux heures  
145 non  
146 on n'a rien vu  
147 on a vu une petite de rien du tout comme une grosse  
souris  
148 (laughter)  
149 tu crois  
150 que c'était un ours?  
151 ben  
152 Bill il dit  
153 que c'était un ours probablement

154 on était dans  
155 on était dans la région des ours  
156 (inaudible)  
157 oh dis donc  
158 oh oui!  
159 c'est  
160 ça peut être vraiment dangereux  
161 ah oui!  
162 oui  
163 ça peut être très dangereux  
164 c'est pour ça  
165 ils sont beaux sur les photos  
166 oui  
167 mais ils attaquent pas  
168 euh  
169 sans motif en général  
170 (inaudible)  
171 en général mais  
172 mais si ils ont très faim  
173 euh  
174 hein?  
175 et oui

176 mais alors  
177 il faudrait  
178 (inaudible)  
179 les  
180 les  
181 les  
182 les ours de la région de l'Orégon là où il fait froid  
183 tout ça  
184 bon  
185 ils ont faim  
186 hein!

**Division of "Orégon" into independent clauses (translation)**

1 yes yes of course uh  
2 it was a trip west  
3 and we were in  
4 uh  
5 I think  
6 that it was Oregon  
7 are there bears there in Oregon?  
8 oh yes  
9 yes  
10 that's it

11 it was Oregon!  
12 and uh  
13 we were camping  
14 and on all the tables it was written  
15 uh  
16 "keep food away  
17 put it in the car and the car far from the tent  
18 bears  
19 bears attack!"  
20 laughter  
21 that's nice  
22 huh!  
23 we were  
24 we were in a valley  
25 there were some  
26 some  
27 some  
28 some  
29 some sort of  
30 mountains all around  
31 and so  
32 they attack

33 and then uh so  
34 we left the next day  
35 because we never used to stay more than one day in  
the same place  
36 it was a trip  
37 at one point we arrive in a very thick forest in the  
middle of the night  
38 it was truly remarkable  
39 so  
40 we pitch our tent  
41 uh  
42 we play in  
43 in  
44 in the lantern light  
45 we play at  
46 at  
47 it's not checkers  
48 it's take the pieces  
49 the pieces  
50 the women?  
51 at black gammon  
52 backgammon  
53 at jacquet!

54 I don't know how  
55 to say it in French  
56 at jacquet!  
57 it was jacquet  
58 ah  
59 we play jacquet  
60 and uh  
61 all of a sudden against the tent there's something  
there  
62 that is going by quickly!  
63 (laughter)  
64 I assure you!  
65 that  
66 that is brushing the tent  
67 (laughter)  
68 so  
69 Bill goes  
70 "who's out there?"  
71 (laughter)  
72 and then  
73 he says to me  
74 "Martine! my glasses!  
75 protecting his wife!



76 (laughter)  
77 yes  
78 wait  
79 so  
80 he says  
81 "Martine my glasses!"  
82 (laughter)  
83 but  
84 I say to myself  
85 who is this imbecile  
86 saying to me  
87 "my glasses!"  
88 now he is  
89 whoever is going to attack us  
90 they don't know  
91 that he can't see anything  
92 (loud laughter)  
93 no  
94 but  
95 we were in the middle of the night and also in a thick  
forest  
96 and he's saying to me  
97 "my glasses!"

98 oh  
99 (inaudible)  
100 who had brushed the tent  
101 so  
102 me paralysed  
103 who  
104 who was reacting  
105 (laughter)  
106 because I said  
107 this is it  
108 it's going to come down on us  
109 (laughter)  
110 this is the end  
111 and then uh so  
112 (laughter)  
113 I find his glasses  
114 how ridiculous you are  
115 to have said that!  
116 and uh  
117 after  
118 after he left with the lamp  
119 and he looked

120 nothing  
121 so  
122 after a few minutes  
123 uh  
124 we finished the game  
125 right  
126 we  
127 we  
128 we go to sleep therefore  
129 uh  
130 we are almost asleep  
131 when we hear  
132 (makes the sound of footsteps)  
133 in the leaves of the forest  
134 which were coming  
135 yes  
136 which were coming towards us  
137 it was clearly steps  
138 one would have said human steps  
139 and so I assure you  
140 we left  
141 we folded the tent

142 we spent the night in the car  
143 and did you see what it was?  
144 we left at two o'clock  
145 no  
146 we didn't see anything  
147 we saw a little something like a big mouse  
148 (laughter)  
149 do you think  
150 that it was a bear?  
151 well  
152 Bill says  
153 that it was probably a bear  
154 we were in  
155 we were in the region of bears  
156 (inaudible)  
157 oh really  
158 oh yes!  
159 it's  
160 it can be truly dangerous  
161 ah yes!  
162 yes  
163 it can be very dangerous

164 it's for that reason  
165 they are beautiful in pictures  
166 yes  
167 but they don't attack  
168 uh  
169 without a motive in general  
170 (inaudible)  
171 in general but  
172 but if they are very hungry  
173 uh  
174 right?  
175 why yes  
176 but then  
177 it must be  
178 (inaudible)  
179 the  
180 the  
181 the  
182 the bears in Oregon there where it is cold  
183 and all  
184 well  
185 they are hungry

186 huh!

**Polanyian Main Line Story Event Clauses**

34	on s'en va le lendemain
40	on plante la tente
61	tout d'un coup contre la tente y a quelque chose là
65/66	qui qui frôle la tente
69	<u>Bill il fait</u> "who's out there?"
73	<u>il me dit</u> "Martine! mes lunettes!"
80	<u>il dit</u> "Martine mes lunettes!"
84	<u>mais moi je me dis</u> "mais qu'est-ce que c'est imbécile il me dit 'mes lunettes!' maintenant il est ceux qui vont nous attaquer ils savent qu'il voit rien"
96	<u>et il me dit</u> "mes lunettes!"
106	<u>parce que j'ai dit</u> "ça y est là on va nous tomber dessus"
113	je trouve ses lunettes
117/118	après après il est sorti avec la lampe
119	et il est cherché
120	rien
122/124	au bout d'un moment on a fini le jeu
126-128	on on on se couche donc
131-133	quand on entend (makes the sound of footsteps) dans les feuilles de la forêt

140            on est sorti  
 141            on a plié la tente  
 142            on a passé la nuit dans la voiture  
 144            on est parti à deux heures

### **Durative-Descriptive Clauses**

2            c'était un voyage dans l'ouest  
 3            et on était dans  
 6            que c'était l'Orégon  
 11           c'était l'Orégon!  
 13           on faisait du camping  
 14           et sur toutes les tables il y avait écrit  
 16           "éloignez la nourriture  
 17           mettez-la dans la voiture et la voiture loin de la  
              tente  
 18/19       des ours les ours attaquent!"  
 23/24       on était on était dans un trou  
 25-30       y avait des des des de des genres de de  
              montagnes tout autour  
 32           ça attaque  
 35           parce qu'on restait jamais plus d'un jour dans le  
              même endroit  
 36           c'était un voyage  
 38           c'était vraiment impressionnant  
 42-46       on joue au à avec la lampe-là on joue au au

51-52	au black gammon backgammon
59	on joue au jacquet
62	qui passe à toute vitesse
70	"who's out there?"
74	"Martine! mes lunettes!"
81	"Martine mes lunettes!"
85-91	mais qu'est-ce que cet imbécile il me dit "mes lunettes!" maintenant il est ceux qui vont nous attaquer ils savent pas qu'il voit rien
95	on était en pleine nuit et puis en forêt dense
97	"mes lunettes!"
100	qui avait frôlé la tente
102	moi paralysée
103-104	qui qui réagissait
107	ça y est là
108	on va nous tomber dessus
110	c'est la fin
134	qui venaient
136	qui venaient en face de nous
137	c'était évident des pas
146	on n'a rien vu
147	on a vu une petite de rien du tout comme une grosse souris

### **Non-Storyworld Clauses**



1           oui oui bien sûr euh  
4           euh  
5           je crois  
7           y a des ours là-bas en Orégon?  
8           oh oui  
9           oui  
10          c'est ça  
12          et euh  
15          euh  
20          (laughter)  
21          c'est sympathique  
22          hein!  
31          et alors  
33          et pis euh bon  
39          bon  
41          euh  
47          c'est pas aux échecs  
48          c'est manger les dames là  
49          les pions  
50          les dames?  
53          au jacquet!  
54          je sais pas comment

55 on dit en français  
56 au jacquet!  
57 c'est au jacquet  
58 ah  
60 et euh  
63 (laughter)  
64 je t'assure!  
67 (laughter)  
68 alors  
71 (laughter)  
72 et puis  
75 protecteur de sa femme!  
76 (laughter)  
77 oui  
78 attends  
79 alors  
82 (laughter)  
83 mais  
92 (loud laughter)  
93 non  
94 mais  
98 oh

101            alors  
105            (laughter)  
109            (laughter)  
111            et puis euh bon  
112            (laughter)  
114-115       qu'est-ce que tu es ridicule d'avoir dit ça  
116            et euh  
121            bon  
123            euh  
125            n'est-ce pas  
129            euh  
135            oui  
138            on aurait dit des pas d'humains  
139            eh ben je t'assure  
143            et vous avez vu ce que c'était?  
145            non  
148            (laughter)  
149-150       tu crois que c'était un ours?  
151            ben  
152-153       Bill il dit que c'était un ours probablement  
154-155       on était dans on était dans la région des ours  
157            oh dis donc

158 oh oui!

159-160 c'est ça peut être vraiment dangereux

161 ah oui!

162 oui

163 ça peut être très dangereux

164-165 c'est pour ça ils sont beaux sur les photos

166 oui

167 mais ils attaquent pas

168 euh

169 sans motif en général?

171 en général mais

172 mais si ils ont très faim

173 euh

174 hein?

175 et oui

176 mais alors

177 il faudrait

179-183 les les les les ours de la région de l'Orégon là où  
il fait froid tout ça

184 bon

185 ils ont faim

186 hein!

### **"Orégon", Main Line Story Event Propositions**

34	The narrator and her husband left the next day.
40	The narrator and her husband pitched the tent.
61/65/66	All of a sudden there was something there which was brushing against the tent.
69	<i>The husband said "who's out there?"</i>
73/80/96	<i>The husband said "Martine! my glasses!"</i>
84	<i>The narrator said to herself "But why is this imbecile saying to me 'my glasses!' now the thing that is going to attack us doesn't know that he can't see anything".</i>
106	<i>The narrator said_ "This is it, it's going to come down on us".</i>
113	The narrator finds her husband's glasses.
117/118	The husband leaves with the lantern.
119	The husband looks.
120	The husband doesn't find anything.
122/124	The narrator and her husband finish their game.
126-128	The narrator and her husband go to sleep.
131-133	The narrator and her husband hear the sound of footsteps in the leaves of the forest.
140	The narrator and her husband left.
141	The narrator and her husband folded the tent.
142	The narrator and her husband spent the night in the car.

144            The narrator and her husband left at two o'clock.

**"Orégon", Durative-Descriptive Clauses**

2                The narrator and her husband were on a trip west.

3/6/11          The narrator and her husband were in Oregon.

13               The narrator and her husband were camping.

14/16-19       It was written on all of the tables "Keep food away. Put it in the car. Put the car far away from the tent. Bears attack".

23/24           The narrator and her husband were in a valley

25-30           Some sort of mountains were all around.

32               Bears attack.

35               The narrator and her husband never stayed more than one day in the same place.

36               The narrator and her husband were on a trip.

38               The scenery was truly remarkable.

42-46/51-52    The narrator and her husband are playing backgammon by the light of the lantern.

59               The narrator and her husband are playing jacquet

62               Something passes by quickly.

70               "*Who's out there?*" is said by the husband.

74/81/97       "*Martine! my glasses!*" is said by the husband.

- 85-91      *But why is this imbecile saying to me 'my glasses!' now the thing that is going to attack us doesn't know that he can't see anything* is said by the narrator to herself.
- 95           The narrator and her husband were in the middle of the night in a dense forest.
- 100          Something had brushed up against the tent.
- 102          The narrator was paralyzed.
- 103-104     The narrator was reacting.
- 107          *This is it* was said by the narrator.
- 108          *It's going to come down on us* is said by the narrator.
- 110          *It's the end* is said by the narrator.
- 134/136     Something was coming toward us.
- 137          That something was clearly footsteps.
- 146          The narrator and her husband didn't see anything.
- 147          The narrator and her husband saw a little something like a big mouse.

Table 1

<b>Clause Number</b>	<b>Clause</b>	<b>Story Event (E), Durative-Descriptive (D), or Non-Storyworld (n.s.)</b>	<b>Proposition + Contential Evaluators</b>	<b>Proposition + Deictic Evaluators</b>	<b>Other Clauses Evaluated by this Clause</b>
1	oui oui bien sûr euh	n.s.			
2	c'était un voyage dans l'ouest	D		Specificatio n, clauses 3, 5-6, 11	
3	et on était dans	D		Specificatio n, clauses 5-6, 11	
4	euh	n.s.			
5	je crois	n.s.		Specificatio n, clause 6	External Comment, clause 6
6	que c'était l'Orégon	D			
7	y a des	n.s		Repetition of	External



	ours là-bas en Orégon?			Orégon, clause 6	Demand, clauses 3-6
8	oh oui	n.s.			External Agreement, clause 7
9	oui	n.s.		Repetition of oui, clause 8	External Agreement, clauses 6-8
10	c'est ça	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 6, 8-9
11	c'était l'Orégon!	D		Repetition of Orégon, clauses 6-7	External Affirmation, clauses 5-6
12	et euh	n.s.			
13	on faisait du camping	D			
14	et sur toutes les tables il y avait écrit	D			Refers to clauses 16-18, 32
15	euh	n.s.			
16	"éloignez la nourriture	D	Indication of danger		Refers to clauses 14, 17-18, 32
17	mettez-la dans la voiture et la voiture loin de la tente	D	Indication of danger		Refers to clauses 14, 16, 18, 32
18	des ours	D	Indication	Repetition of	Refers to

			of danger	ours, clause 7	clauses 14, 16-17, 32
19	les ours attaque nt!"	D	Indication of danger	Repetition of ours, clauses 7, 18	Refers to clauses, 14, 16-18, 32
20	laughter	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 14, 16-19
21	c'est sympathique	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 14, 16-19
22	hein!	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 14, 16-19, 21
23	on était	D			
24	on était dans un trou	D	Volume and pitch increase on trou	Repetition of on était, clause 23; Specification, clauses 25-30	
25	y avait des	D			More Detail, clause 24
26	des	D		Repetition of des, clause 25	More Detail, clause 24
27	des	D		Repetition of des, clauses 25-26	More Detail, clause 24
28	de	D			More Detail, clause 24
29	des genres de	D		Repetition of des, clauses 25-27	More Detail, clause 24

30	de montagn es tout autour	D		Repetition of de, clause 29	More Detail, clause 24
31	et alors	n.s.			
32	ça attaque	D	Indication of danger	Repetition of attaque, clause 19; ça refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19	Refers to clauses 14, 16-19
33	et pis euh bon	n.s.			
34	on s'en va le lendema in	E			
35	parce qu'on restait jamais plus d'un jour dans le même endroit	D			
36	c'était un voyage	D		Repetition of c'était un voyage, clause 2	
37	on arrive un moment dans un genre de forêt dense en pleine nuit	E	Increasing volume and pitch on forêt dense and pleine nuit		

38	c'était vraiment impressionnant	D			Refers to clause 37
39	bon	n.s.			
40	on plante la tente	E			
41	euh	n.s.			
42	on joue au	D			
43	à	D			
44	avec la lampe-là	D			
45	on joue au	D		Repetition of on joue au, clause 42	
46	au	D		Repetition of au, clauses 42, 45	
47	c'est pas aux échecs	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 42-46
48	c'est manger les dames là	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 42-47
49	les pions	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 42-48
50	les dames?	n.s.			External Comment, clause 42-49
51	au black gammon	D			
52	backgammon	D		Repetition of gammon,	

				clause 51	
53	au jacquet!	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 42-49, 51- 52
54	je sais pas comment	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 47- 52
55	on dit en français	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 47- 52, 54
56	au jacquet!	n.s.		Repetition of au jacquet, clause 53	External Exclamation, clauses 47-49, 51- 52, 54-55
57	c'est au jacquet	n.s.		Repetition of au jacquet, clauses 53, 56	External Agreement, clauses 53, 56
58	ah	n.s.			
59	on joue au jacquet	D		Repetition of joue, clauses 42, 45; Repetition of au jacquet, clauses 53, 56-57	
60	et euh	n.s.			
61	tout d'un coup contre la tente y a quelque chose là	E	contre la tente y a quelque chose là is whispered and delivered at a more	Specification, clauses 62, 65-66; Repetition of tente, clause 40	

			rapid rate; Use of tout d'un coup emphasizes surprise and danger		
62	qui passe à toute vitesse!	D	qui passe à toute vitesse! is whispered and delivered at a more rapid rate; Intonation heightens the suspense		Refers to clause 61
63	(laughte r)	n.s.			External Exclamatio n, clauses 61-62
64	je t'assure!	n.s.			External Exclamatio n, clauses 61-63
65	qui	E			
66	qui frôle la tente	E	Increased volume and pitch on frôle	Repetition of qui, clause 65; Repetition of tente, clauses 40, 61	More detail about clauses 61- 62
67	(laughte r)	n.s.			External Exclamatio n, clauses 64-66
68	alors	n.s.			
69	Bill il fait	E			Direct Discourse,

					clause 70
70	"who's out there?"	D	Changed voice quality to imitate a panic-stricken man; Intonation heightens fear	who refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32	
71	(laughte r)	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 69-70
72	et puis	n.s.			
73	il me dit	E		il refers to Bill, clause 69	Direct Discourse, clause 74
74	"Martine ! mes lunettes!"	D	Changed voice quality to imitate a panic-stricken man; Intonation heightens fear; Request for glasses expresses desire to do something	Response to noise, clauses 61-62, 66	
75	protecteur de sa femme!	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 69-70, 73-74
76	(laughte r)	n.s.			External Exclamation

					n, clauses 69-70, 73-74
77	oui	n.s.			External Agreement, clause 75
78	attends	n.s.			External Demand, clauses 75-76
79	alors	n.s.			
80	il dit	E		Repetition of il dit, clause 73	Direct Discourse, clause 81
81	"Martine mes lunettes!"	D	Changed voice quality to imitate a panic-stricken man; Intonation heightens fear; Request for glasses expresses desire to do something	Repetition of "Martine mes lunettes!", clause 74; Response to noise, clauses 61-62, 66	
82	(laughter)	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 80-81
83	mais	n.s.			
84	moi je me dis	E			Reported Thought, clauses 85-91
85	mais qu'est-ce que c'est	D	Use of imbécile	imbécile refers to Bill, clauses	



	imbécile			69, 73, 80	
86	il me dit	D		il refers to Bill, clauses 69, 73, 80; Repetition of il me dit, clauses 73, 80	Direct Dicouse, clause 87
87	"mes lunettes!"	D	Request for glasses expresses desire to do something	Repetition of "mes lunettes!", clauses 74, 81; Response to noise, clauses 61-62, 66	
88	maintenant il est	D		il refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70	
89	ceux qui vont nous attaquer	D		ceux refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88; Repetition of attaquer, clauses 19, 32	
90	ils savent	D		ils refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-89	
91	qu'il voit rien	D	voit rien suggests Bill's inability to do anything	il refers to Bill, clauses 69, 73, 80, 86; voit rien refers to	

				request for glasses, clauses 74, 81, 87	
92	(loud laughter )	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 83-91
93	non	n.s.			External Comment, clause 92
94	mais	n.s.			
95	on était en pleine nuit et puis en forêt dense	D	Increased volume and pitch on pleine nuit and forêt dense	Repetition forêt dense and pleine nuit, clause 37; Justification of opinion in clauses 83-91	
96	et il me dit	E		il refers to Bill, clauses 69, 73, 80, 86; Repetition of il me dit, clauses 73, 80, 86	Direct Discourse, clause 97
97	"mes lunettes!"	D	Changed voice quality to imitate a panic-stricken man; Intonation heightens fear; Request for glasses	Repetition of "mes lunettes!", clauses 74, 81, 87; Response to noise, clauses 61-62, 66	

			expresses desire to do something		
98	oh	n.s.			External Exclamation
99	(inaudible)				
100	qui avait frôlé la tente	D		qui refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90; Repetition of frôle la tente, clause 66; Repetition of tente, clauses 40, 61, 66	
101	alors	n.s.			
102	moi paralysée	D	Use of paralysée emphasizes fear		
103	qui	D			
104	qui réagissait	D		Repetition of qui, clause 103	
105	(laughter)	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 95-104
106	parce que j'ai dit	E			Reported Thought, clauses 107-108, 110

107	ça y est là	D	Emphasize s perceived threat to their lives		
108	on va nous tomber dessus	D	Emphasize s feared outcome	on refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90, 100	
109	(laughte r)	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 106-108
110	c'est la fin	D	Emphasize s perceived threat to their lives	Repetition of idea in clause 107	
111	et puis euh bon	n.s.			
112	(laughte r)	n.s.			External Exclamation, clause 110
113	je trouve ses lunettes	E		Result of Request, clauses 74, 81, 87, 97	
114	qu'est-ce que tu es ridicule	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 85-91
115	d'avoir dit ça	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 85-91
116	et euh	n.s.			
117	après	E			
118	après il	E		Repetition of	

8	est sorti avec la lampe			après, clause 117; Repetition of lampe, clause 44	
11 9	et il est cherché	E			
12 0	rien	E			
12 1	bon	n.s.			
12 2	au bout d'un moment	E			
12 3	euh	n.s.			
12 4	on a fini le jeu	E		le jeu refers to jacquet, clauses 53, 56-57, 59	
12 5	n'est-ce pas	n.s.			External Comment, clause 124
12 6	on	E			
12 7	on	E		Repetition of on, clause 126	
12 8	on se couche donc	E		Repetition of on, clauses 126-127	
12 9	euh	n.s.			
13 0	on va presque s'endor mir	D		Result of clause 128	
13 1	quand on entend	E		Mirrors event described in clauses 61-	

				62, 66, 100	
13 2	(makes the sound of footstep s)	E	Non- linguistic noise heightens uncertainty	Mirrors event described in clauses 61- 62, 66, 100	
13 3	dans les feuilles de la forêt	E	Rate of delivery is slowed	Mirrors event described in clauses 61- 62, 66, 100	
13 4	qui venaient	D			
13 5	oui	n.s.			External Comment, clause 134
13 6	qui venaient en face de nous	D		Repetition of qui venaient, clause 134	
13 7	c'était évident des pas	D	Increased volume and pitch on pas	Repetition of pas, clause 132	
13 8	on aurait dit des pas d'humai ns	n.s.		Repetition of pas, clauses 132, 137	External Comment, clause 132, 137
13 9	eh ben je t'assure	n.s.	More rapid delivery	Repetition of je t'assure, clause 64	External Comment, clauses 132, 137- 138
14 0	on est sorti	E	More rapid delivery; Reaction to danger		Clustering of a number of events, clauses 140-142

14 1	on a plié la tente	E	More rapid delivery	Repetition of tente, clauses 40, 61, 66, 100	Clustering of a number of events, clauses 140-142
14 2	on a passé la nuit dans la voiture	E	More rapid delivery; Reaction to danger		Clustering of a number of events, clauses 140-142
14 3	et vous avez vu ce que c'était?	n.s.			External Demand, clauses 131-134, 136-137
14 4	on est parti à deux heures	E	Reaction to danger	Repetition of idea in clause 140	
14 5	non	n.s.		Specificatio n, clauses 146-147	External Comment, clause 143
14 6	on n'a rien vu	D	Use of negative evaluates by suggesting that it was hypothesize d that something might have been seen.		
14 7	on a vu une petite de rien du tout comme	D	Choice of phrase emphasizes their fear		

	une grosse souris				
14 8	(laughte r)	n.s.			External Exclamatio n, clause 147
14 9	tu crois	n.s.			External Demand, clauses 131-134, 136-137
15 0	que c'était un ours?	n.s.		Repetition of ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90, 100, 108	External Demand, clauses 131-134, 136-137, 149
15 1	ben	n.s.			
15 2	Bill il dit	n.s.		Repetition of Bill, clauses 69, 73, 80, 86, 96; Repetition of il dit, clauses 73, 80, 86, 96	External Comment, clauses 149-150; Indirect Discourse, clause 153
15 3	que c'était un ours probable ment	n.s.		Repetition of ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90, 100, 108, 150	External Comment, clauses 149-150
15 4	on était dans	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 149-150
15 5	on était dans la	n.s.		Repetition of on était	Extenal Comment,



	région des ours			dans, clause 154; Repetition of location, clauses 2- 11; Repetition of ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90, 100, 108, 150, 153	clauses 149-150
15 6	(inaudible)				
15 7	oh dis donc	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 151-155
15 8	oh oui!	n.s.			External Agreement, clauses 151-155
15 9	c'est	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 140-142, 144
16 0	ça peut être vraiment dangereux	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 140-142, 144, 159
16 1	ah oui!	n.s.		Repetition of oui, clause 158	External Agreement, clauses 157-160
16 2	oui	n.s.		Repetition of oui, clauses 158, 161	External Agreement, clauses 157-160

163	ça peut être très dangereux	n.s.		Repetition of ça peut être dangereux, clause 160	External Agreement, clause 160
164	c'est pour ça	n.s.			External Comment, clauses 160, 163
165	ils sont beaux sur les photos	n.s.		ils refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90, 100, 108, 150, 153, 155	External Comment, Entrance Talk
166	oui	n.s.			External Agreement, clauses 164-165
167	mais ils attaquent pas	n.s.		ils refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90, 100, 108, 150, 153, 155, 165; Repetition of attaquent, clauses 19, 32, 89; Specification, clause 169	External Demand, clauses 160, 163
168	euh	n.s.			
169	sans motif en général?	n.s.			External Demand, clauses 160-163

170	(inaudible)				
171	en général mais	n.s.		Repetition of en général, clause 169; Specification, clause 125	External Comment, clauses 167, 169
172	mais si ils ont très faim	n.s.		ils refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90, 100, 108, 150, 153, 155, 165, 167	External Comment, clauses 167, 169
173	euh	n.s.			
174	hein?	n.s.			External Exclamation, clauses 171-172
175	et oui	n.s.			External Agreement, clauses 172-173
176	mais alors	n.s.			
177	il faudrait	n.s.			External Comment
178	(inaudible)				
179	les	n.s.			
180	les	n.s.		Repetition of les, clause 179	
181	les	n.s.		Repetition of les, clauses 179-180	

18 2	les ours de la région de l'Orégon là où il fait froid	n.s.		Repetition of les, clauses 179-181; Repetition of ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90, 100, 108, 150, 153, 155, 165, 167, 172; Repetition of Orégon, clauses 6-7, 11; Repetition of location, clauses 2-11	External Comment
18 3	tout ça	n.s.			External Comment
18 4	bon	n.s.			
18 5	ils ont faim	n.s.		Repetition of ils ont faim, clause 172; ils refers to ours, clauses 7, 18-19, 32, 70, 88-90, 100, 108, 150, 153, 155, 165, 167, 172, 182	External Comment, clause 172
18 6	hein!	n.s.			External Exclamatio n, clauses 179-185



**"Orégon"; Clauses receiving eight or more points**

25 points:

18 des ours

23 points:

7 y a des ours là-bas en Orégon?

22 points:

32 ça attaque

21 points:

19 les ours attaque!

19 points:

70 "who's out there?"

89 ceux qui vont nous attaquer

18 points:

88 maintenant il est

17 points:

61 tout d'un coup contre la tente y a quelque chose là

16 points:

90 ils savent

15 points:

100 qui avait frôlé la tente

14 points:

6 que c'était l'Orégon

13 points:

62 qui passe à toute vitesse!

66 qui frôle la tente

130 que c'était un ours?

12 points:

108 on va nous tomber dessus

11 points:

73 il me dit

74 "Martine! mes lunettes!"

87 "mes lunettes!"

10 points:

16 "éloignez la nourriture

17 mettez la dans la voiture et la voiture loin de la tente

69 Bill il fait

86 il me dit

153 que c'était un ours probablement

9 points:

14 et sur toutes les tables il y avait écrit

42 on joue au

80 il dit

81 "Martine mes lunettes!"

8 points:

24 on était dans un trou

45 on joue au  
 47 c'est pas aux échecs  
 132 (makes the sound of footsteps)  
 155 on était dans la région des ours  
 160 ça peut être vraiment dangereux  
 172 mais si ils ont très faim

**Breakdown of the different types of Non-Storyworld clause in "Orégon"**

**External Exclamations uttered by Martine**

64 je t'assure!  
 71 All: (laughter)  
 82 All: (laughter)  
 98 oh  
 105 All: (laughter)  
 109 (laughter)  
 112 All: (laughter)  
 186 hein!

**External Exclamations uttered by Recipients**

20 B.,C.: (laughter)  
 22 C: hein  
 53 C: au jacquet!  
 56 E: au jacquet!



63 ? : (laughter)  
 67 ? : (laughter)  
 71 All: (laughter)  
 75 E: protecteur de sa femme!  
 76 C., B.: (laughter)  
 82 All: (laughter)  
 92 C,B,E: (loud laughter)  
 105 All: (laughter)  
 112 All: (laughter)  
 148 E: (laughter)  
 157 C: oh dis donc  
 174 C: hein?

**External Comments uttered by Martine**

5 je crois  
 10 c'est ça  
 47 c'est pas aux échecs  
 48 c'est manger les dames là  
 54 je sais pas comment  
 55 on dit en français  
 93 non  
 125 n'est-ce pas  
 138 on aurait dit des pas d'humains

139 eh ben je t'assure  
 145 non  
 152 Bill il dit  
 153 que c'était un ours probablement  
 154 on était dans  
 155 on était dans la région des ours  
 164 c'est pour ça  
 165 ils sont beaux sur les photos  
 177 il faudrait  
 182 les ours de la région de l'Orégon là où il fait froid  
 183 tout ça  
 185 ils ont faim

**External Comments uttered by Recipients**

21 C: c'est sympathique  
 50 B: les dames?  
 114 E: qu'est-ce que tu es ridicule  
 115 E: d'avoir dit ça  
 135 C: oui  
 159 B: c'est  
 160 B: ça peut être vraiment dangereux  
 171 B: en général mais  
 172 C: mais si ils ont très faim

**External Agreement uttered by Martine**

9            oui  
57           c'est au jacquet  
77           oui  
161          ah oui!  
162          oui  
163          ça peut être très dangereux  
175          et oui

**External Agreement uttered by Recipients**

8     B:    oh oui  
158   B:    oh oui  
166   C:    oui

**External Demands uttered by Martine**

7            y a des ours là-bas en Orégon?  
78           attends

**External Demands uttered by Recipients**

143   C:    et vous avez vu ce que c'était?  
149   C:    tu crois  
150   C:    que c'était un ours?  
167   C:    mais ils attaquent pas  
169   C:    sans motif en général?

**Neutral Non-Storyworld Clauses uttered by Martine**

1	oui oui bien sûr euh
4	euh
12	et euh
15	euh
31	et alors
33	et pis euh bon
39	bon
41	euh
58	ah
60	et euh
68	alors
72	et puis
79	alors
83	mais
94	mais
101	alors
111	et puis euh bon
116	et euh
121	bon
123	euh
129	euh
151	ben

176	mais alors
179	les
180	les
181	les
184	bon

#### Neutral Non-Storyworld Clauses uttered by Recipients

168	C:	euh
173	C:	euh

### **Appendix 3 "histoire-géographie"**

#### "histoire-géographie", Interactive Representation

1	M:	ah non ah non ah non
2		en histoire-géo
3		euh
4		d'abord toute l'année
5		j'ai été la dernière
6	C:	oui moi aussi
7	M:	toute l'année
8		j'ai été la dernière
9		j'avais 2
10		j'avais 4
11		à chaque fois que Papa me disait
12		euh

13 "mais tu as tu as pas de leçon d'histoire-géo?"  
14 je fais "non non c'est une récitation aujourd'hui"  
15 même au lycée  
16 j'inventais des récitations  
17 j'ai appris des textes par coeur  
18 j'ai appris de tout  
19 j'ai même appris du du Lénine du Sartre  
20 euh [ les les ]  
21 E: [du Lénine?]  
22 ah dis donc  
23 [alors là je veux (inaudible) à avaler]  
24 M: [ oui oui je je (inaudible) ]  
25 à chaque fois je lui disais  
26 euh  
27 "oui oui j'ai une récitation  
28 euh  
29 on doit pratiquer  
30 euh  
31 la révolution russe  
32 on a un texte de Lénine"  
33 j'ai inventé des trucs pas possibles  
34 alors j'apprenais

35 j'apprenais ces trucs par coeur  
36 mais en histoire jamais  
37 rien  
38 je n'avais rien à faire de tout ça  
39 et puis alors  
40 euh  
41 le prof nous on avait un prof quand même un  
peu exigeant  
42 parce que non seulement il fallait connaître les  
évènements  
43 mais il fallait savoir analyser  
44 E: mmm mmm  
45 M: et et comparer avec d'autres pays  
46 [enfin tu vois ou alors euh]  
47 E: [ oui mm mm ]  
48 M: en terminant  
49 alors j'étais atroce!  
50 alors euh  
51 pour le bac  
52 pour les révisions  
53 Papa m'a pris en main  
54 et puis il m'a dit  
55 euh

56 "que pour l'histoire-géo  
 57 euh  
 58 tu tu il faut que tu aies la moyenne"  
 59 euh  
 60 c'est pas possible  
 61 une fille nulle en histoire-géographie  
 62 qui ne sait rien  
 63 alors j'ai pris mon amie  
 64 qui était la deuxième plus nulle de la classe  
 65 All: (laughter)  
 66 M: on a travaillé ensemble  
 67 le jour de l'oral je suis tombée sur le Front  
 Populaire  
 68 C: (inaudible) à l'oral?  
 69 tu as eu la l'histoire-géo [en oral, toi?]  
 70 M: [(inaudible) ]  
 71 j'étais A5 j'étais A5 j'étais pas [ (inaudible)  
 ]  
 72 E: [ah oui parce que moi  
 j'étais]  
 73 C: mais moi aussi!  
 74 mais c'était en écrit [ histoire-géo!  
 ]



75 M: [ah non moi je l'ai eu en  
oral]

76 E: moi c'était moi c'était à l'oral aussi

77 M: non non moi je l'ai eu à l'oral

78 C: oh non moi [c'était en écrit coefficient 3 hein!]

79 M: [ (inaudible) ]

80 non non c'était [ coefficient 3 mais c'était à l'oral  
]

81 E: [alors moi c'était (inaudible)  
coefficient]

82 [ je pense que c'est ]

83 C: [comment ça se fait?]

84 E: c'était même coefficient 4 mais moi j'étais

85 euh

86 en A littéraire hein!

87 M: moi j'étais en A5 [trois langues ]

88 C: [ben moi aussi]

89 j'étais en A5!

90 M: non non! moi je sais que je l'ai passé à l'oral  
parce que j'ai eu [ le Front Populaire de 1936 ]

91 C: [Tu l'as passé en quelle année?]

92 M: 77 (throat clearing)

93 [ le bac ]

94 C: [79 moi]

95 c'est peut-être ça  
 96 [ça avait peut-être changé]  
 97 M: [ ça venait de changer ]  
 98 E: [ oui c'était (inaudible) ]  
 99 M: parce que moi c'était à l'oral  
 100 et euh  
 101 cette femme  
 102 le Front Populaire que je savais tout par coeur  
 103 j'ai vraiment tout appris  
 104 alors je savais bêtement évidemment  
 105 E: ouais  
 106 M: je répétais des mots bêtement  
 107 enfin le prof même l'analyse il nous l'avait  
 donnée  
 108 j'ai eu  
 109 euh  
 110 16 ou 18  
 111 E: MMM!  
 112 enfin pas possible  
 113 une des meilleures notes de de tout le groupe

"histoire-géographie", Interactive Representation, translation

1 M: oh no oh no oh no

2 in history-geography  
3 uh  
4 first of all all year  
5 I was the last  
6 C: yes me too  
7 M: all year  
8 I was the last  
9 I used to get 2  
10 I used to get 4  
11 and each time Papa used to tell me  
12 uh  
13 "but you don't you don't have a history-  
geography assignment?"  
14 I go "no no it's a recitation today"  
15 even at school  
16 I used to invent recitations  
17 I learned texts by heart  
18 I learned everything  
19 I even learned some Lenin and some Sartre  
20 uh [the the]  
21 E: [Lenin?]  
22 oh my  
23 [well there I want (inaudible) to swallow]

24 M: [ yes yes I I (inaudible) ]  
25 and each time I used to say to him  
26 uh  
27 "yes yes I have a recitation  
28 uh  
29 we have to practice  
30 uh  
31 the Russian revolution  
32 we have a text from Lenin"  
33 I invented things that were impossible  
34 so I used to learn  
35 I used to learn these things by heart  
36 but in history never  
37 nothing  
38 I wouldn't have anything to do with that  
39 and so then  
40 uh  
41 the teacher we had a teacher who was  
nevertheless a little bit demanding  
42 because not only did we have to know the events  
43 but we also had to know how to analyze  
44 E: mmm mmm  
45 M: and and compare with other countries

46 [so you see or so uh]  
47 E: [ yes mm mm ]  
48 M: at the end  
49 so I was atrocious!  
50 so uh  
51 for the bac  
52 for the revisions  
53 Papa took charge of me  
54 and then he said to me  
55 uh  
56 "that for history-geography  
57 uh  
58 you you you must have a passing grade"  
59 uh  
60 this is not possible  
61 a girl who is worthless in history-geography  
62 who doesn't know anything  
63 so I took my friend  
64 who was the second most worthless in the class  
65 All: (laughter)  
66 M: we worked together  
67 the day of the oral I fell upon the Popular Front

68 C: (inaudible) as an oral?

69 you had history-geography [as an oral?]

70 M: [(inaudible)]

71 I was A5 I was A5 I wasn't [ (inaudible) ]

72 E: [oh yes because I was]

73 C: but me too!

74 but history-geography [ was written! ]

75 M: [oh no I had it as an oral]

76 E: for me it was an oral too

77 M: no no I had it as an oral

78 C: oh no for me [it was written coefficient 3 huh!]

79 M: [ (inaudible) ]

80 no no it was [ coefficient 3 but it was an oral  
]

81 E: [well for me it was (inaudible)  
coefficient]

82 [I think that it's ]

83 C: [how can that be?]

84 E: it was even coefficient 4 but I was

85 uh

86 in A littéraire huh!

87 M: I was in A5 [three languages]

88 C: [ well so was I ]

89 I was in A5!

90 M: no no! I know that mine was an oral because I  
had [ the 1936 Popular Front ]

91 C: [what year did you take it in?]

92 M: 77 (throat clearing)

93 [ the bac ]

94 C: [79 for me]

95 maybe that's it

96 [maybe it had changed]

97 M: [ it had just changed ]

98 E: [yes it was (inaudible) ]

99 M: because mine was oral

100 and uh

101 this woman

102 the Popular Front that I knew all by hearth

103 I truly learned it all

104 of course I knew mechanically

105 E: yeah

106 M: I repeated the words mechanically

107 and the teacher had even given us the analysis

108 I got

109 uh

110 16 or 18

- 111 E: MMM!  
112 M: really not possible  
113 one of the best grades of of the whole group

"l'histoire-géographie", Labovian Representation

- a ah non ah non ah non en histoire-géo euh d'abord  
toute l'année j'ai été la dernière
- A oui moi aussi
- b toute l'année j'ai été la dernière
- c j'avais 2
- d j'avais 4
- e à chaque fois que Papa me disait euh "mais tu as tu as  
pas de leçon d'histoire-géo?"
- f je fais "non non c'est une récitation aujourd'hui"
- g même au lycée j'inventais des récitations
- h j'ai appris des textes par coeur
- i j'ai appris de tout
- j j'ai même appris du du Lénine du Sartre euh les les
- J du Lénine?
- k ah dis donc alors là je veux (inaudible) à avaler
- K oui oui je je (inaudible)
- l à chaque fois je lui disais euh "oui oui j'ai une  
récitation euh
- m on doit pratiquer euh la révolution russe



n on a un texte de Lénine"

o j'ai inventé des trucs pas possibles

p alors j'apprenais j'apprenais ces trucs par coeur  
mais en histoire jamais rien

q je n'avais rien à faire de tout ça

r et puis alors euh le prof nous on avait un prof quand même un peu exigeant  
  
parce que non seulement il fallait connaître les événements  
  
mais il fallait savoir analyser et et comparer avec d'autres pays

R mmm mmm

s enfin tu vois ou alors euh en terminant alors j'étais atroce!

S oui mm mm

t alors euh pour le bac pour les révisions Papa m'a pris en main

u et puis il m'a dit euh "que pour l'histoire-géo euh tu tu il faut que tu aies la moyenne"

v euh c'est pas possible une fille nulle en histoire-géographie  
  
qui ne sait rien

w alors j'ai pris mon amie  
  
qui était la deuxième plus nulle de la classe

W (laughter)

x on a travaillé ensemble

y le jour de l'oral je suis tombée sur le Front Populaire

Y (inaudible) à l'oral? tu as eu la l'histoire-géo en oral, toi?

y (inaudible) j'étais A5

y j'étais A5

y j'étais pas (inaudible)

Y ah oui parce que moi j'étais

Y mais moi aussi mais c'était en écrit histoire-géo!

y ah non moi je l'ai eu en oral

Y moi c'était moi c'était à l'oral aussi

y non non moi je l'ai eu à l'oral

Y oh non moi c'était en écrit coefficient 3 hein!

y (inaudible) non non c'était coefficient 3

mais c'était à l'oral

Y alors moi c'était (inaudible) coefficient

Y je pense que c'est c'était même coefficient 4

mais moi j'étais euh en A littéraire hein!

Y comment ça se fait?

y moi j'étais en A5 trois langues

Y ben moi aussi j'étais en A5

y non non! Moi je sais que je l'ai passé à l'oral

parce que j'ai eu le Front Populaire de 1936

Y tu l'as passé en quelle année?

y 77 (throat clearing) le bac

Y 79 moi

Y c'est peut-être changé

y ça venait de changer

Y oui c'était (inaudible)

y parce que moi c'était à l'oral

z et euh cette femme le Front Populaire que je savais tout par coeur

aa j'a vraiment tout appris

bb alors je savais bêtement évidemment

BB ouais

cc je répétais des mots bêtement

dd enfin le prof même l'analyse il nous l'avait donnée

ee j'ai euh euh 16 ou 18

EE MMM!

ff enfin pas possible une des meilleurs notes de tout le groupe

## **Appendix 4 "pruneaux"**

"pruneaux", Interactive Representation

1 M: alors les pruneaux

2 E: les pru[neaux]

3 M: [ mon ] dernier souvenir au sujet des  
pruneaux

4 E: (small laugh)

5 M: j'avais sept ans

6 c'était mon anniversaire

7 on le fêtait en Algérie

8 ma grand-mère

9 arabe

10 pour euh

11 fêter cela

12 très gentiment et pleine d'enthousiasme]

13 E: [(laughter)]

14 M: avait préparé

15 ce plat

16 de viande

17 aux pruneaux

18 et elle en était fière et puis elle le cuisinait  
depuis [deux jours]

19 C,E: [(laughter)]

20 M: elle a fait [je me souviens pas de la viande]

21 E: [c'est pas la méthode américaine!]

22 M: [mais peut-être du mouton tu vois]

23 E: [(laughter) (inaudible)]

24 M: elle avait fait mij- mijoter ça en activant le feu  
[évidemment]

25 E: [ oui oui ]

26 M: et euh

27 elle était tellement fière de ça

28 et donc euh

29 on s'attable

30 et puis alors évidemment Papa et Maman  
m'avaient toujours appris à dire que c'était bon  
même si je devais m'étouffer avec

31 E: (laughter) [ (inaudible) ]

32 M: [et on me sert] donc de ce

33 de ce truc et mon d-

34 mais ça c'est je m'en souviens encore

35 ?: mm hmm

36 M: euh

37 uh je goûte

38 l'horreur l'horreur (whispering)

39 j'étais je sais pas allergique c'é-

40 [ça m'allait pas]

41 E: [ (laughter) ]

42 M: ces [pruneaux avec cette viande]

43 E: [ (laughter) ]

44 M: alors j'ai bien mangé de la viande

45 et je sais

46 non alors Papa m'a regardée et puis il a regardé  
les pruneaux

47 C,E: (laughter) (continues through line 59)

48 M: alors j'ai compris évidemment

49 alors j'ai

50 j'ai commencé à manger mes pruneaux

51 j'ai même dit que c'était bon

52 ma grand-mère gentille qui [m'en a resservi]

53 C: [ Ah la la la! ]

54 M: parce que là-bas si tu en reprends pas tu  
comprends c'est

55 c'est impoli

56 E: cest la cime!

57 M: j'ai jamais oublié ces pruneaux!

58 ç'a été mon repas le plus atroce de ma vie et  
c'était mon anniversaire

59 C: oh [quelle horreur!]

60 M: [ et j'ai dit ] que c'était bon et j'ai dû  
finir deux assiettes

61 B, E: (laughter)

62 M: depuis je n'ai [plus mangé un petit pruneaux]

63 C: [et ça c'est une petite fille ] bien élevée  
hein

- 64 M: oh ben tu sais quand tu as le regard de Papa  
comme ça et puis il regarde les pruneaux
- 65 E: ah oui

"pruneaux", Interactive Representation, translation

- 1 M: well prunes
- 2 E: pru[nes]
- 3 M: [my] last memory about prunes
- 4 E: (small laugh)
- 5 M: I was 7 years old
- 6 it was my birthday
- 7 we were celebrating it in Algeria
- 8 my grandmother
- 9 Arab
- 10 to uh
- 11 celebrate it
- 12 very nicely and full of enthu[siasm ]
- 13 E: [(laughter)]
- 14 M: had prepared
- 15 this dish
- 16 of meat
- 17 with prunes

18 and she was proud of it and also she had been  
cooking it for [two days]

19 C,E: [(laughter)]

20 M: she made [I don't remember the meat]

21 E: [it's not the American method!]

22 M: [well maybe it was lamb you see]

23 E: [ (laughter) (inaudible) ]

24 M: she had simmered it by rousing the fire[of  
course]

25 E: [yes yes]

26 M: and uh

27 she was so proud of it

28 and so uh

29 we sit down

30 and then so of course Papa and Mama had  
always taught me to say that something was  
good even if I was going to choke on it

31 E: (laughter) [ (inaudible) ]

32 [so they serve me] this

33 this thing and my

34 but this I still remember

35 ?: mm hmm

36 M: uh

37 uh I taste



38           The horror the horror (whispering)  
 39           I was I don't know allergic it  
 40           [it didn't agree with me]  
 41   E:     [        (laughter)        ]  
 42   M:     those [prunes with that meat]  
 43   E:           [     (laughter)     ]  
 44   M:     so I easily ate the meat  
 45           and I know  
 46           no so Papa looked at me and then he looked at  
             the prunes  
 47   C,E:   (laughter) (continues through line 59)  
 48   M:     so I understood clearly  
 49           so I  
 50           I started to eat my prunes  
 51           I even said that it was good  
 52           my nice grandmother who [served me more]  
 53   C:                                   [ Ah la la la!    ]  
 54   M:     because there if you don't take more you  
             understand it's  
 55           it's impolite  
 56   E:     it's the end of the world!  
 57   M:     I never forgot those prunes!  
 58           that was the worst meal of my life and it was my  
             birthday

- 59 C: oh [how horrible!]
- 60 M: [ and I said ] that it was good and I had to  
finish two plates
- 61 B, E: (laughter)
- 62 M: since then I have [never eaten one little prune]
- 63 C: [and that is a well mannered]  
little girl
- 64 M: of well you know when you have your Papa  
looking at you like that and then he looks at the  
prunes
- 65 E: oh yes

## **Appendix 5 "boudin"**

### "boudin", Interactive Representation

- 1 C: ah! je me souviens de manger un boudin à 4h00  
qui était froid!
- 2 oh!
- 3 je me souviendrai ç- toujours ça ma mère on
- 4 on avait mangé du boudin
- 5 j'aimais pas le boudin
- 6 M: ah oui c'était bizarre comme [consistance]
- 7 C: [ je savais ] que  
c'était du sang rien que de savoir ça j'en j'aimais pas le  
boudin
- 8 E: oui [c'était (inaudible)]

9 C: [alors puis tout ça]  
 10 alors bon  
 11 le boudin je tardais à le manger [ (inaudible)  
 ]  
 12 M: [avec la purée  
 hein]  
 13 M: [avec la purée]  
 14 C: [avec la purée] non je sais pas  
 15 j'avais mangé la purée il restait le boudin  
 évidemment  
 16 M: (laughter)  
 17 C: ça aurait été mieux de  
 18 dans la purée [non non]  
 19 E: [ oui ]  
 20 C: ben il restait le boudin  
 21 et puis quand c'est- manger du boudin cuit  
 quand il est froid tiens!  
 22 E: [oh c'est horrible!]  
 23 M: [ oh la la! ]  
 24 C: [hein! hein! ]  
 25 M: [ mon Dieu! ]  
 26 C: [alors ma mère] elle voulait que je finisse  
 27 j'étais restée jusqu'à 4h00 de l'après-midi avec  
 mon boudin

- 28           mes frères ils jouaient dehors moi j'étais là avec  
             mon boudin
- 29           "non je veux pas! non je veux pas!" (in a whiny  
             voice)
- 30    E:    (laughter)
- 31    C:    "tu mangeras ton boudin!" (loudly in a mother's  
             voice)
- 32           (laughter)

"boudin", Interactive Representation, translation

- 1       C:    oh! I remember eating a cold blood sausage at 4  
             o'clock!
- 2           oh!
- 3           I will always remember that my mom we
- 4           we had eaten blood sausage
- 5           I didn't like blood sausage
- 6    M:    oh yes it had a bizarre [consistency]
- 7    C:                               [ I knew ] that it was  
         blood simply knowing that I I didn't like blood sausage
- 8    E:    yes [it was (inaudible)]
- 9    C:               [ so then all that ]
- 10          well so
- 11          I would put off eating the blood sausage  
             [(inaudible)               ]

12 M: [with the purée right]  
13 M: [with the purée]  
14 C: [with the purée] no I don't know  
15 I had eaten the purée and of course the blood  
sausage remained  
16 M: (laughter)  
17 C: it would have been better to  
18 in the purée [no no]  
19 E: [ yes ]  
20 C: so the blood sausage was still there  
21 and then when it's -- to eat cooked blood  
sausage when it's cold yes see!  
22 E: [ oh it's horrible! ]  
23 M: [ oh la la! ]  
24 C: [you see! you see!]  
25 M: [ my God! ]  
26 C: [so my mom] she wanted me to finish it  
27 I had stayed there until 4 o'clock in the  
afternoon with my blood sausage  
28 my brothers were playing outside I was there  
with my blood sausage  
29 "no I don't want it! no I don't want it!" (in a  
whiny voice)  
30 E: (laughter)

- 31 C: "you will eat your blood sausage!" (loudly in a  
mother's voice)
- 32 (laughter)

## **Appendix 6 "histoire-géographie, Christine"**

"histoire-géographie, Christine", Interactive Representation

- 1 E: [oui c'était bien ça c'était vraiment bien]
- 2 C: [moi je me souviens on avait j'avais déc-]  
3 on avait décidé moi et une copine de réviser  
4 [tu vois bien]
- 5 E: [c'est ça oui]
- 6 C: l'histoire-géographie surtout parce qu'on était  
nulle
- 7 M: c'était le pire l'his[toire-géographie]
- 8 E: [ah non! J'ai eu une excellente  
note]
- 9 C: [et alors]
- 10 M: ah oui mais toi t'es historienne!
- 11 E: oui c'est ça! c'est pour ça que [j'adorais ça!]
- 12 C: [et on avait]
- 13 M: l'histoire mon Dieu! mon Dieu! [c'est oh là là]
- 14 C: [et on avait]
- 15 attends!

16           on avait décidé avec ma copine de  
 17           de réviser, mais bien travailler parce que quoi  
              crotte alors hein!

18    E:   [c'est vrai!]

19    C:   [alors on]

20           on allait au lycée toutes les deux tu vois  
 21           de plus on (inaudible) on se donnait rendez vous  
              au lycée et puis on regardait les mecs (loud  
              laughter)

22    C,M,E:       (laughter)

23    E:   on dit (inaudible)

24    C:   on était là ouais et puis après on se regardait  
              toutes les deux on dit merde on est quand même venu  
              pour travailler (uttered quickly and with laughter)

25           (loud laughter)

26           on repartait on repartait chez moi toutes les  
              deux on se faisait du pain perdu (uttered quickly  
              and with laughter)

27           (loud laughter)

28    E:   (laughter/more like a chuckle)

29    C:   je crois que j'ai eu 6

30           (laughter)

31           [j'avais pas du tout (inaudible) oh là là!]

32    M:   [ah non! ah non! ah non!]

"histoire-géographie, Christine", Interactive Representation,  
translation

- 1 E: [yes that was good it was really good]  
2 C: [I remember we had I had dec-]  
3 we had decided me and a friend to review  
4 [so you see]  
5 E: [that's it yes]  
6 C: history-geography above all because we were  
worthless  
7 M: history-geography [was the worst]  
8 E: [ah no! I got an excellent  
grade]  
9 C: [and so]  
10 M: ah yes but you are a historian!  
11 E: yes that's it! that's why [I adored it!]  
12 C: [and we had]  
13 M: history my God! my God! [it's oh là là]  
14 C: [and we had]  
15 wait!  
16 we had decided with my friend to  
17 to review but to really work because well crap  
right!  
18 E: [it's true!]  
19 C: [so we]



20 the two of us went to school you see

21 and wha'ts more we (inaudible) wet set a metting  
at school and then we looked at guys (loud  
laughter)

22 C,M,E: (laughter)

23 E: we say (inaudible)

24 C: we were there yeah and then after we looked at  
each other we say shit we did still come here to work  
(uttered quickly and with laughter)

25 (loud laughter)

26 we left we left for my house both of us we made  
French toast (uttered quickly and with laughter)

27 (loud laughter)

28 E: (laughter/more like a chuckle)

29 C: I think I got a 6

30 (laughter)

31 [I didn't at all (inaudible) oh là là!]

32 M: [ ah no! ah no! ah no! ]

"l'histoire-géographie, Christine" Labovian Representation

a moi je me souviens on avait j'avais déc- on avait  
décidé moi et une copine de réviser tu vois bien

A c'est ça oui

b l'histoire-géographie surtout parce qu'on était  
nulle et alors et on avait

B c'était le pire l'his[toire-géographie]

B [ah non ! J'ai eu une excellente  
note]

B ah oui mais toi t'es historienne !

B oui c'est ça ! c'est pour ça que j'adorais ça !

B l'histoire mon Dieu ! mon Dieu ! [c'est oh là là]

c [et on avait]  
attends ! on avait décidé avec ma copine de de  
réviser

d mais bien travailler parce que quoi crotte alors  
hein !

D [c'est vrai !]

e [alors on] on allait au lycée toutes les deux tu  
vois

f de plus on (inaudible) on se donnait rendez-vous  
au lycée

g et puis on regardait les mecs (loud laughter)

G (laughter)

G on dit (inaudible)

h on était là ouais

i et puis après on se regardait toutes les deux

j on dit merde on est quand même venu pour  
travailler (uttered quickly and with laughter)

j (loud laughter)

k on repartait on repartait chez moi toutes les  
deux (uttered quickly and with laughter)

l            on se faisait du pain perdu (uttered quickly and  
with laughter)

k            je crois que j'ai eu 6

K            (laughter)

L            (laughter/more like a chuckle)

m            je crois que j'ai eu 6

M            (laughter)

n            j'avais pas du tout (inaudible) oh là là

"histoire-géographie, Christine" Labovian Representation,  
translation

a            I remember we had I had dec- we had decided  
me and a friend to review so you see

A            that's it yes

b            history-geography above all because we were  
worthless and so and we had

B            history-geography [            was the worst  
]

B            [ah no! I got an excellent  
grade]

B            ah yes but you are a historian!

B            yes that's it! that's why I adored it!

B            history my God! my God! [it's oh là là]

c            [and we had] wait! We  
had decided with my friend to to review

d            but to really work because well crap right!

D [it's true!]  
 e [so we] the two of us went to school you see  
 f and what's more we (inaudible) we set a meeting  
 at school  
 g and then we looked at guys (loud laughter)  
 G (laughter)  
 G we say (inaudible)  
 h we were there yeah  
 i and then after we looked at each other  
 j we say shit we did still come here to work  
 (uttered quickly and with laughter)  
 j (loud laughter)  
 k we left we left for my house both of us (uttered  
 quickly and with laughter)  
 l we made French toast (uttered quickly and with  
 laughter)  
 L (laughter/more like a chuckle)  
 m I think I got a 6  
 M (laughter)  
 n I didn't at all (inaudible) oh là là

"histoire-géographie, Christine" Polanyian Representation

1 moi je me souviens  
 2 on avait

3 j'avais déc  
4 on avait décidé moi et une copine de réviser  
l'histoire-géographie surtout  
5 tu vois bien  
**6** c'est ça  
**7** oui  
8 parce qu'on était nulle  
**9** c'était le pire l'histoire-géographie  
**10** ah non!  
**11** j'ai eu une excellente note  
12 et alors  
**13** ah oui  
**14** mais toi t'es historienne!  
**15** oui  
**16** c'est ça!  
**17** c'est pour ça  
**18** que j'adorais ça!  
19 et on avait  
**20** l'histoire mon Dieu!  
**21** mon Dieu!  
**22** c'est oh là là  
23 et on avait

24 attends!  
25 on avait décidé avec ma copine de  
26 de réviser  
27 mais bien travailler  
28 parce que quoi crotte alors hein!  
**29** c'est vrai!  
30 alors on  
31 on allait au lycée toutes les deux  
32 tu vois  
33 de plus on (inaudible)  
34 on se donnait rendez-vous au lycée  
35 et puis on regardait les mecs  
36 (loud laughter)  
37/**37** (laughter)  
**38** on dit (inaudible)  
39 on était là  
40 ouais  
41 et puis après on se regardait toutes les deux  
42 on dit  
43 "merde on est quand même venu pour travailler"  
40-43 (uttered quickly and with laughter)  
44 (loud laughter)

45 on repartait  
 46 on repartait chez moi toutes les deux  
 47 on se faisait du pain perdu  
 45-47 (uttered quickly and with laughter)  
 48 (loud laughter)  
**49** (laughter/more like a chuckle)  
 50 je crois  
 51 que j'ai eu 6  
 52 (laughter)  
 53 j'avais pas du tout (inaudible) oh là là!

"histoire-géographie, Christine", Non-Storyworld Clauses

1 moi je me souviens  
 5 tu vois bien  
**6** c'est ça  
**7** oui  
**9** c'était le pire l'histoire-géographie  
**10** ah non!  
**11** j'ai eu une excellente note  
 12 et alors  
**13** ah oui  
**14** mais toi t'es historienne!

**15** oui  
**16** c'est ça!  
**17** c'est pour ça  
**18** que j'adorais ça!  
**20** l'histoire mon Dieu!  
**21** mon Dieu!  
**22** c'est oh là là  
24 attends!  
28 parce que quoi crotte alors hein!  
**29** c'est vrai!  
32 tu vois  
36 (loud laughter)  
37/**37** (laughter)  
**38** on dit (inaudible)  
40 ouais  
40-43 (uttered quickly and with laughter)  
44 (loud laughter)  
45-47 (uttered quickly and with laughter)  
48 (loud laughter)  
**49** (laughter/more like a chuckle)  
50 je crois  
52 (laughter)



Breakdown of the different types of Non-Storyworld Clauses in  
"histoire-géographie, Christine"

Neutral Non-Storyworld Clauses uttered by Christine

- |    |                    |
|----|--------------------|
| 1  | moi je me souviens |
| 12 | et alors           |

External Exclamations uttered by Christine

- |       |                                     |
|-------|-------------------------------------|
| 28    | parce que quoi crotte alors hein!   |
| 36    | (loud laughter)                     |
| 37    | (laughter)                          |
| 40-43 | (uttered quickly and with laughter) |
| 44    | (loud laughter)                     |
| 45-47 | (uttered quickly and with laughter) |
| 48    | (loud laughter)                     |
| 52    | (laughter)                          |

External Exclamations uttered by Recipients

- |    |                            |
|----|----------------------------|
| 14 | mais toi t'es historienne! |
| 18 | que j'adorais ça           |
| 20 | l'histoire mon Dieu!       |
| 21 | mon Dieu!                  |

22	c'est oh là là
37	(laughter)
49	(laughter/more like a chuckle)

#### External Comments uttered by Christine

4	tu vois bien
32	tu vois
40	ouais
50	je crois

#### External Comments uttered by Recipients

9	c'était le pir l'histoire-géographie
17	c'est pour ça
38	on dit (inaudible)

#### External Agreement uttered by Recipients

6	c'est ça
7	oui
13	ah oui
15	oui
16	c'est ça
29	c'est vrai

### External Disagreement uttered by Recipients

10            ah non!

11 j'ai eu une excellente note

### External Demands uttered by Christine

24 attends!

## Appendix 7 "le grec"

## "le grec", Interactive Representation

1       E:     oui oui j'ai eu aussi du grec

2 C: ah c'est bien! (laughter)

3 E: c'était

4            alors le grec! c'était

5 c'était affreux!

6 M: oh là là

7 E: j'ai je crois que j'ai [eu]

8 C: [alpha beta hein!]

9 E: j'ai eu

10           oui c'est ça

11            j'ai eu attends

12 j'ai dû avoir quelque chose comme 4 sur 20

13 ou un truc comme ça

14           heureu-  
15           oh le grec là j'en pou-  
16           alors le grec c'était horrible  
17           je  
18           j'avais horreur de ça  
19           mais j'avais horreur horreur horreur de ça  
20           aller en classe je changeais de visage tu sais  
21           je pâlais si j'avais quelque chose à faire si le  
            prof me demandait quelque chose  
22           c'était horrible  
23           j'ai jamais  
24           mais tu vois je changeais de personnalité hein  
25           j'é- j'étais [pas]  
26    C:                   [mmm]  
27    E:    du tout timide en classe ni rien mais alors  
            quand c'était un cours de grec  
28           (inaudible) personne  
29           hein là vraiment tu vois c'était  
30    C:    sous la table  
31    E:    [sous la table]  
32    M:    [j'ai suivi] un an de grec

"le grec", Interactive Representation, translation

1 E: yes yes I also had Greek  
2 C: ah that's good! (laughter)  
3 E: it was  
4 well Greek! it was  
5 it was atrocious!  
6 M: oh là là  
7 E: I I think that I [ got ]  
8 C: [alpha beta right!]  
9 E: I got  
10 yes that's it  
11 I got wait  
12 I must have gotten something like 4 out of 20  
13 or something like that  
14 hap-  
15 oh Greek that I cou-  
16 well Greek was horrible  
17 I  
18 I hated it  
19 but I hated hated hated it  
20 to go to class my face changed you know  
21 I became pale if I had to do something if the prof  
asked me something  
22 it was horrible

23 I never  
 24 but you see I changed personality you see  
 25 I was[n't]  
 26 C: [mmm]  
 27 E: at all timid in class or anything but well when it  
 was a Greek class  
 28 (inaudible) nobody  
 29 you see there truly you see it was  
 30 C: under the table  
 31 E: [under the table]  
 32 M: [I took] a year of Greek

## **Appendix 8 "soupe"**

"soupe", Interactive Representation

1 E: moi je me rappelle c'est la soupe  
 2 j'avais horreur de la soupe  
 3 oh la soupe c'était vraiment le  
 4 enfin on en avait pas très souvent  
 5 on en avait su-  
 6 M: [en hiver]  
 7 C: [hiver]  
 8 E: [surtout l'hiver]

9 et le soir

10 C: [oui (inaudible) ]

11 E: [alors là ça allait] parce que

12 euh dans

13 enfin dans certaines régions tu en a même à  
midi hein dans [ le sud hein! ]

14 C: [oui oui c'est vrai]

15 E: mais là euh

16 heureusement on n'en avait que le soir et quand  
il faisait très froid ce qui faisait

17 quand il fait très froid à Bourges c'est quand il  
fait zéro (laughter)

18 C: oui oui!

19 E: [c'était l'exception]

20 C, M: [ (laughter) ]

21 C: [c'est comme c'est comme en au ouil]

22 E: [ (laughter) ]

23 alors donc quand il faisait très très froid (uttered  
while laughing)

24 qu'il ne gelait pas mais qu'il faisait très froid  
(uttered while laughing)

25 on avait de la soupe (uttered while laughing)

26 alors ça c'était la soupe c'était

27 vraiment le [problème]

28 C: [ ah moi ] j'aimais bien moi  
29 soupe aux [poireaux et tout]  
30 E: [ah non non non ]

"soupe", Interactive Representation, translation

1 E: I remember it's soup  
2 I hated soup  
3 oh soup it was truly the  
4 in fact we didn't have it very often  
5 we had it above-  
6 M: [in winter]  
7 C: [winter]  
8 E: [above all in winter]  
9 and in the evening  
10 C: [yes (inaudible) ]  
11 E: [so there it was ok] because  
12 euh in  
13 in fact in certain regions you even have it for  
lunch right in [the south right!]  
14 C: [yes yes it's true]  
15 E: but there euh  
16 luckily we only had it in the evening and when it  
was very cold which was



17           when it's very cold in Bourges is when it's zero  
(laughter)

18    C:    yes yes!

19    E:    [it was the exception]

20    C, M: [       (laughter)       ]

21    C:    [it's like it's like in in yes!]

22    E:    [               (laughter)               ]

23           so therefore when it was very very cold (uttered  
while laughing)

24           it wasn't freezing but it was very cold (uttered  
while laughing)

25           we had soup (uttered while laughing)

26           so it was soup it was

27           truly a [problem]

28    C:               [ ah me] I really liked it

29           leek soup [ and all    ]

30    E:               [ah no no no ]

## **Appendix 9 "lire les mains"**

"lire les mains", Interactive Representation

1       M:    euh

2           euh comment elle s'appelle Annie Fritz

3           je

4 j'ai lu les lignes de sa main  
 5 l'autre fois  
 6 E: oui  
 7 M: [et j'ai passé] pas mal de temps dessus du reste  
 8 E: [ (laugh) ]  
 9 M: mais enfin j'ai découvert euh que  
 10 euh  
 11 je sais plus quel âge je lui ai dit l'âge exact  
 évidemment  
 12 je crois que c'était 21 ou 22 ans  
 13 euh que  
 14 je lui ai dit euh  
 15 tu as  
 16 tu as dû prendre une décision vitale c'était au  
 point de vue de la santé et c'est pourquoi  
 aujourd'hui je te parle  
 17 sinon tu serais morte  
 18 elle en pouvait plus  
 19 C: alors [ c'était quoi? ]  
 20 M: [elle tremblait presque]  
 21 ah ben elle m'a  
 22 j'ai pas demandé de détail toutes [manières]  
 23 E: [ oui ]  
 24 M: ça me regarde pas

25 E: oui  
26 M: non enfin elle a  
27 elle a bien  
28 bien approuvé  
29 c'est Peter aussi  
30 euh un jour je lui lisais sa main et j'ai vu je lui  
ai dit à 14 ans  
31 tu as quitté l'état dans lequel tu habitais  
32 et je lui ai dit euh  
33 c'était pour des raisons euh  
34 liées à  
35 alors euh  
36 j'ai pas dit exactement euh  
37 ce que c'était parce que j'avais pas vu  
38 mais je lui ai dit que quand il est revenu  
39 il était guéri  
40 hé pour sûr à 14 ans enfin quand il était jeune il  
se droguait  
41 très gravement  
42 E: mmm hmm mmm hmm  
43 M: et ses parents l'ont envoyé je  
44 je crois que c'était l'Iowa  
45 il en revenait pas

46           et quand il est revenu évidemment guéri  
 47   E:    mmmm  
 48   M:    il en revenait pas  
 49           mais enfin donc  
 50   C:    [et moi? lis lis mon passé lis mon passé]  
 51   E:    [           attends c'est le moment           ]  
 52   M:    vous êtes sûres [que vous voulez que]  
 53   E:                   [       ça va       ]  
 54   C:                   [ j'ai rien à cacher! ]

Shortly after this narrative, Betsy reopens the topic of hand-reading causing Martine to launch a series of narratives which further develop the subject. (Because I will be referring to these multiple narratives on the topic of hand-reading as a whole, line numbering will continue where it left off at the end of the last excerpt).

55   B:    mais où c'est que tu a appris à lire les mains?  
 56   C:    [ oui ]  
 57   M:    [je n'ai] jamais appris c'est ça c'est ça qui est  
 euh  
 58           étonnant  
 59           qui est tout à fait  
 60           tout à fait incroyable  
 61           non parce que dans ma vie

62 j'ai vu quand même pas mal de mains  
 63 et euh  
 64 par exemple  
 65 Nancy alors elle a fait la réputation très vite  
 parmi ses étudiants Jean-Marc aussi  
 66 euh ou parmi ses amis leurs amis  
 67 et on dit euh  
 68 oui oui il y a une fille ici qui lit les mains  
 69 alors on m'a on m'a amené des gens  
 70 euh enfin des fois je suis au bureau en train de  
 travailler quand quelqu'un me dit  
 71 "on m'a dit que [vous lisiez les mains]  
 72 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 73 M: non alors le problème c'est que chaque main  
 prend au moins une demi-heure  
 74 pour le faire  
 75 [honnêtement]  
 76 E: [sérieusement]  
 77 M: chaque  
 78 oui voilà  
 79 chaque main prend au moins une demi-heure  
 80 et puis il est très facile qu'on passe une heure et  
 demie sur  
 81 sur une main

82           donc des gens que je n'ai jamais vus  
83           alors bon je vois des choses euh futures je vois  
             des choses présentes et je vois aussi pas mal de  
             choses passées  
84           mais qui sont sidérées  
85           qui sont sidérées  
86           je je vois des des des choses  
87           et ben!  
88           euh Bill m'a présentée à sa famille  
89           donc euh  
90           plus tard on s'est fiancé  
91           et puis alors euh les fiançailles évidemment  
92           toute toute la famille était venue de partout sa  
             famille à lui  
93           et puis euh y avait un certain Bob  
94           alors euh je sais plus comment  
95           c'est  
96           related  
97           enfin qui fait partie de la famille qui est marié à  
             une femme  
98           mais je je le je le  
99           je le rencontrais pour la première fois  
100          et puis euh

101 il c'est c'est c'est un type qui est très marrant  
 euh  
 102 qui dit des blagues  
 103 bon-vivant  
 104 qui aime manger enfin  
 105 il me plaisait bien  
 106 outgoing tout ça  
 107 et on était assis l'un à côté de l'autre  
 108 et je ne sais pas comment  
 109 E: (laughter)  
 110 M: c'était venu  
 111 E: (laughter)  
 112 M: mais j'ai remarqué  
 113 enfin il parlait  
 114 et puis j'ai vu un  
 115 un truc qui m'a frappée dans sa main parce  
 qu'évidemment  
 116 je ne cherche pas toujours  
 117 par exemple c'est un business truc  
 118 un truc d'affaires  
 119 je je ne cherche pas spécialement les trucs  
 d'affaires dans les mains  
 120 C: mmm hmmm  
 121 M: on me présente une main et ça

122 E: [ ça dépend oui ]  
 123 M: [ça m'inspire quoi] ça parle  
 124 E: oui oui  
 125 M: et et  
 126 et je lui dis oh!  
 127 il y a un voyage  
 128 a . . . alors il se demandait de quoi je parlais  
 129 C: (laughter)  
 130 M: et puis je dis il va pas se faire  
 131 mais je je l'ai vu  
 132 je sais pas ça m'a frappée  
 133 quand on présente une main  
 134 E: [mmm hmmm]  
 135 M: [ des fois ] il y a des choses qui  
 136 et puis il y a des mains aussi [qui n'inspirent  
 pas]  
 137 E: [qui ne disent rien ]  
 138 oui  
 139 C: qui disent rien  
 140 M: alors euh  
 141 il m'a montré donc sa main  
 142 je ne savais absolument rien de lui je savais pas  
 qu'il était du tout un homme d'affaires



143 E: mmm  
 144 M: alors euh j'ai vu  
 145 j'ai même vu des des choses avec sa femme  
 146 les les relations avec sa femme  
 147 et j'ai même vu les problèmes  
 148 alors alors les gens évidemment s'inquiètent  
 quand  
 149 [tu dis que le]  
 150 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 151 M: problème est là  
 152 parce que c'est cette croix ici alors  
 153 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 154 C: [(laughter) (inaudible)]  
 155 M: et puis euh  
 156 je lui ai dit mais  
 157 E: puis c'est tellement fascinant  
 158 M: je lui [ ai dit ]  
 159 E: [enfin le] passé [ le futur ] les  
 révélations  
 160 C: [mmm hmmm]  
 161 M: alors je lui ai dit  
 162 il y a  
 163 il y a un voyage d'affaires qui

164           qui se prépare pour cette semaine alors c'est  
               probablement un week-end on a dû euh  
 165           et et  
 166           je  
 167           je lui ai dit que c'était vers le jeudi  
 168           mais que de toutes manières il ne le ferait pas  
 169           alors ça le faisait rire ça le faisait rire parce qu'il  
               avait le billet d'avion  
 170           dans les compagnies on a on a toujours les  
               billets à l'avance  
 171           l'hôtel de réservé  
 172           il riait bien de voir  
 173           que je lui disais que  
 174           non son  
 175           alors le mercredi soir tout content presque il  
 nous  
 176           il nous annonce que non  
 177           il s'est rien passé  
 178   E:       [ il téléphone oui ]  
 179   M:       [il part bien demain]  
 180   E., C.:       (laughter)  
 181   M:       et puis au dern c'était c'est incroyable  
 182           parce que je veux dire euh  
 183           je sais pas pourquoi je l'ai vu dans sa main ça

184            au dernier moment il n'est pas parti  
 185 E:        (laughter)  
 186 M:        la compagnie a dû annuler  
 187            bon je me souviens plus mais la compagnie a  
               annulé  
 188 E:        ils on téléphoné [j'espère]  
 189 M:                            [ enfin ]  
 190            et ben il en pouvait plus  
 191            il était tout à  
 192            bon alors il y a pas ça qui l'a étonné  
 193            pas que ça  
 194            mais il y a y avait d'autres choses je sais pas sa  
               main m'a extrêmement inspirée  
 195 E.,C.: mmm hmmm  
 196 M:        et j'ai je lui ai dit un tas de choses sur sa femme  
 197            sur sa jeunesse à lui sur  
 198 E:        mmm  
 199 M:        il il il en revenait pas  
 200            alors ça a fait le tour de la famille  
 201            j'ai eu droit aux mains de tout le monde  
 202 E:        [(laughter)]  
 203 C:        [ ah oui! ]  
 204 M:        [oui c'est le problème ça]

205 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 206 M: tu sais dès qu'on apprend  
 207 et puis euh  
 208 l'autre fois récemment  
 209 C: et Bill t'a demandé ta main  
 210 E: [(laughter) oui c'est ça ce fut un échange!]  
 211 M: [ là là là où mais Jean-Marc ]  
 212 mais Jean-Marc Jean-Marc  
 213 C: Jean-Marc  
 214 M: mais je lui ai dit des choses  
 215 mais il me prenait pour une folle [ il disait ]  
 216 E: [oui c'est ça]  
 217 M: enfin il connaissait sa vie quand même de [il a  
 24 ans maintenant]  
 218 E: [(laughter)  
 oui c'est ça]  
 219 M: et je lui ai dit  
 220 c'est au début qu'il était aux Etats-Unis je lui ai  
 vu un tas de choses un tas de choses il dit  
 221 "mais elle divague"  
 222 E: (laughter)  
 223 M: tout  
 224 tout ce que j'ai dit à Jean-Marc

225           mais c'est incroyable!

226 E:       alors il te prend pour euh

227           [pour le Messie maintenant!]

228 M:     [       tout pratiquement       ]

229           mais enfin il m'a envoyé ses girlfriends [ses  
femmes ses]

230 C.,E.:   [(laughter)  
  
                                ]

231 E:       son harem!

232 M:     [il me dit "celle-là il faut que je la lui fasse  
confiance? est-ce que tu penses?]

233 E:     [   (laughter)  
  
  ]

234 M:     [non mais c'est j'ai j'ai vu des choses]

235 E:     [   (laughter)                         ]

236 M:     bon écoutez Elisabeth Caron

237           ça c'est très étonnant

238           parce que je ne vois pas généralement la folie  
dans les mains

239           vous savez la folie alors là on parle de fous hein

240           [de maisons]

241 E:     [       mmm       ]

242 M:     d'asiles d'aliénés etc.

243            alors un jour évidemment au département ça fait  
le tour

244            la main d'Annick Fritz

245            [la main de Peter]

246 E:        [     (laughter)     ]

247 M:        la main

248            enfin j'ai vu plusieurs mains

249            ce jour-là

250            alors aussi c'est mauvais de voir trop de mains  
d'un coup hein

251 E:        ah bon?

252 M:        et puis euh

253            ah oui il vaut mieux les voir [espacées]

254 E:    [ oui oui ]

255 M:        et puis euh

256            donc Elisabeth Caron me dit

257            "et moi

258            qu'est-ce que tu vois"

259            alors là c'est c'était bizarre

260            parce que

261            j'ai vu sa ligne de vie

262            c'était coupée

263            et puis ça reprenait

264 et c'était pourtant pas une mort  
 265 [ j'étais certaine ]  
 266 E: [les résurrections] c'est rare [quand même]  
 267 M: [ j'é j'é ]  
 268 j'étais certaine que ce n'était pas une mort  
 269 j'ai finalement examiné les croix puisqu'en  
 principe c'est ce qui guide  
 270 j'ai  
 271 j'ai j'ai examiné les autres lignes j'ai vu les les  
 relations familiales  
 272 j'ai vu le le le boulot  
 273 j'ai vu le caractère les voyages etc.  
 274 et puis finalement je lui ai dit  
 275 "écoute Elisabeth  
 276 ne t'offense pas  
 277 ne te vexe pas de ce que [ je vais te dire"  
 ]  
 278 E: [mais c'est quand même]  
 279 une sacrée révélation [ (laughter) ]  
 280 M: ["de ce que je vais te dire"]  
 281 mais je lui ai dit exactement l'âge  
 282 alors je me souviens plus euh  
 283 52 ans  
 284 enfin je sais plus quel âge

285 je lui dit "il y a une période de 3 ans  
 286 où on dirait que tu es dans le coma"  
 287 je lui dit "pourtant il y a pas d'accident"  
 288 (short break in tape)  
 289 une période de 3 ans je lui dis exactement l'âge  
 290 il faut le faire ça aussi  
 291 par exemple Jean-Marc je lui ai dit sa première  
 relation sexuelle il en revenait pas à quel âge  
 quel âge il l'avait  
 292 C.,E.: [ (laughter) ]  
 293 M: [il en revenait pas (inaudible)]  
 294 B.,C.,E.: [ (laughter)  
 ]  
 295 M: [enfin on sait tous maintenant qu'il n'est plus  
 vierge]  
 296 E: [oui c'est ça!] (laughs while speaking)  
 297 C.,B.: [ (laughter) ]  
 298 E: elle sait même ça  
 299 M: alors  
 300 alors il y avait donc un trou de 3 ans  
 301 je lui ai dit  
 302 "euh Elisabeth  
 303 je vois une période de coma mais il y a pas  
 d'accident ça m'intrigue"



304 j'ai bien examiné cette ligne  
305 et je lui ai dit  
306 "ne te vexe pas  
307 mais tu vas être dans un asile d'aliénés  
308 d'aliénés  
309 pendant 3 ans  
310 et  
311 tu  
312 de toutes manières tu vas en sortir  
313 tu tu n'es pas perdue  
314 tu vas en ressortir et tu seras tout à fait comme  
avant"  
315 et ben elle était pratiquement sidérée  
316 parce qu'il y a plusieurs années  
317 elle a vu  
318 une voyante professionnelle  
319 qui exactement  
320 E: qui lui a dit [la même chose]  
321 M: [au même âge ]  
322 mais au même âge hein  
323 je sais pas si c'est 52 ou 47  
324 au même âge  
325 pendant la même période

326 peut-être un demi-an de près  
 327 lui a vu euh  
 328 de la folie  
 329 et en plus dans sa famille mais ça moi je le  
 savais pas  
 330 il y a eu effectivement des cas de de folie  
 331 E: mmm  
 332 M: bon ça c'est une chose qui l'a sidérée  
 333 après euh  
 334 E: [ (inaudible) ]  
 335 M: [elle me dit elle me dit] elle me dit "les enfants  
 336 les enfants j'ai combien d'enfants"  
 337 alors évidemment tout le monde sait  
 qu'Elisabeth a des enfants [on] sait pas  
 forcément combien elle en elle en a mais  
 338 E: [oui]  
 339 M: alors j'appuie  
 340 à la recherche donc des enfants  
 341 et je lui dis "c'est bizarre"  
 342 et ça je je savais absolument pas  
 343 je lui dis "je vois beaucoup d'enfants  
 344 mais j'en vois des morts"  
 345 elle me dit "could they be the miscarriages?"  
 346 et je lui dit "oui"

347 B: mmm  
 348 M: tu vois!  
 349 [ des choses ]  
 350 E: [mmm hmmm]  
 351 M: alors évidemment ça fait le tour du département  
 352 et puis alors de temps en temps j'ai j'ai des  
 personnes inconnues comme ça  
 353 qui viennent me voir à mon bureau  
 354 E: (laughter)  
 355 M: très timidement [ du reste]  
 356 E: [c'est c'est] pas [pour le français]  
 357 M: [ non mais j'ai ]  
 358 E: c'est pas le tutorial  
 359 M: [j'ai oui alors j'ai commencé à dire]  
 360 B.,C.,E.: [ (laughter) (inaudible) ]  
 361 M: non mais maintenant je refuse si tu veux parce  
 que je je dis  
 362 vous vous comprenez à chaque fois c'est une  
 demie-heure sur une main  
 363 j'ai j'ai pas le temps  
 364 E: oui  
 365 M: parce que si je peux pas le faire en 5 minutes  
 366 E: mmm hmmm mmm hmmm  
 367 M: il y en a une elle partait à Montpellier

368 elle est venue me voir une étudiante de Nancy  
369 que je n'avais jamais rencontré  
370 je lui dit euh  
370 [des choses]  
371 E: [ ah non ] Montpellier non non [(laughter)]  
372 M: [qui  
concernaient]  
373 qui concernaient sa vie familiale  
374 ses relations avec son père et sa mère  
375 que je n'aurais  
376 enfin je veux dire je je n'aurais même pas à y  
penser c'est pas une question d'imagination  
377 c'est une question de voir des lignes qui  
inspirent  
378 E: mmm  
379 M: ou qui n'inspirent pas  
380 et les mots viennent tous seuls  
381 elle était complètement sidérée  
382 et Nancy ne n'a jamais parlé de cette étudiante  
je sais même pas comment elle s'appelle  
383 E: ben tu vois ça peut [être une seconde une  
seconde profession]  
384 M: [et donc comme disait  
Madame]  
385 Madame Barnes je n'ai jamais appris

386           à lire les lignes de la main  
 387 E:    mais ça t'est [venu comment? Mais il y a  
           quelqu'un dans] ta famille qui t'a un peu guidé ou?  
 388 M:                   [       je n'ai absolument jamais  
           appris     ]  
 389           non non absolument pas  
 390           ce qu'il y a c'est que le  
 391           le peuple les peuples arabes sont  
 392 E:    mmm hmmm  
 393 M:    sont des peuples qui sont vraiment  
           supersticieux  
 394           et qui croient  
 395           euh [   au   ]  
 396 E:           [mmm]  
 397 M:    au grain de blé enfin  
 398           euh il y a beaucoup de femmes  
 399           dans les les villages qui disent l'avenir dans les  
           grains de blé  
 400 E:    mmm hmmm  
 401 M:    en France c'est plutôt les les tarots  
 402 E:    oui [oui]  
 403 M:           [euh]  
 404           et puis alors il y a en principe les  
 405           les gitanes

406 E: oui les [gitanes]

407 M: [ qui ] regardent dans les mémoires  
 enfin il faut se méfier surtout en France parce qu'elles  
 enlèvent la montre

408 E: oui

409 M: pendant qu'elles [lisent les lignes de la main]

410 E: [ (laughter) ]

411 M: c'est très connu

412 mais je n'ai jamais appris

413 je n'ai jamais eu

414 quelqu'un qui m'a dit euh

415 c'est cette croix c'est ça

416 je sais pas si c'est à force de de très tôt

417 ça ça [ m'a intrigué ]

418 E: [ça t'a intrigué]

419 M: j'ai regardé les lignes des des mains des gens et  
 puis

420 euh je je parle

421 E: mais t'as pas lu parce qu'il y a [des livres aussi]

422 M: [ non non ]

423 E: [ euh pas mal de trucs ]

424 M: [non j'ai absolument rien lu j'ai]

425 E: mais ça t'a pas incité à

426 à faire des lectures?

427 [des choses non]  
428 M: [non parce que ] tu comprends je  
429 dans dans ma philosophie personnelle [je suis  
euh]  
430 E: [ mmm ]  
431 M: je suis extrêmement anti-déterminisme  
432 E: oui oui  
433 M: et moi-même euh je je ris  
434 de des choses que je dis aux gens

"lire les mains", Interactive Representation, translation

1 M: euh  
2 euh what's her name Annie Fritz  
3 I  
4 I read the lines of her hand  
5 awhile ago  
6 E: yes  
7 M: [and I spent] quite a bit of time doing it by the  
way  
8 E: [ (laugh) ]  
9 M: but at last I discovered euh that  
10 euh  
11 I can't remember any more at what age it was I  
told her the exact age of course

12 I think that it was 21 or 22  
13 euh that  
14 I told her euh  
15 you had  
16 you had to make a vital decision it was about  
health and it is why I'm talking to you today  
17 if not you would be dead  
18 she couldn't get over it  
19 C: so [ what was it? ]  
20 M: [she was almost trembling]  
21 ah sho she to me did  
22 in any case I didn't ask for [details]  
23 E: [ yes ]  
24 M: it is none of my business  
25 E: yes  
26 M: no at last she  
27 she quite  
28 quite agreed  
29 it's Peter too  
30 euh one day I was reading his palm and I saw I  
told him at age 14  
31 you left the state you lived in  
32 and I told him



33           it was for reasons euh  
34           linked to  
35           well euh  
36           I didn't say exactly euh  
37           which was because I didn't see  
38           but I told him that when he returned  
39           he was cured  
40           hey for sure at age 14 or when he was young he  
            used drugs  
41           very seriously  
42    E:     mmm hmm mmm hmm  
43    M:     and his parents sent him to I  
44           I think that it was Iowa  
45           he couldn't get over it  
46           and when he returned clearly cured  
47    E:     mmmm  
48    M:     he couldn't get over it  
49           but so at last  
50    C:     [and me? read read my past read my past]  
51    E:     [               wait it's time               ]  
52    M:     are you sure [     that you want     ]  
53    E:               [           it's ok           ]  
54    C:               [I have nothing to hide!]

Shortly after this narrative, Betsy reopens the topic of hand-reading causing Martine to launch a series of narratives which further develop the subject. (Because I will be referring to these multiple narratives on the topic of hand-reading as a whole, line numbering will continue where it left off at the end of the last excerpt).

- 55 B: but where did you learn to read palms?  
56 C: [yes]  
57 M: [ I ] never learned that's what is euh  
58 surprising  
59 what is truly  
60 truly unbelievable  
61 no because in my life  
62 I've seen nonetheless quite a few hands  
63 and euh  
64 for example  
65 Nancy well she quickly spread the reputation  
among her students Jean-Marc too  
66 euh or among her friends their friends  
67 and it is said euh  
68 yes yes there is a girl here who reads palms  
69 so people people were sent to me

70 euh so sometimes I'm in my office working when  
someone tells me

71 "I was told that [you read palms]

72 E: [ (laughter) ]

73 M: no but the problem is that each hand takes at  
least a half hour

74 to do it

75 [honestly]

76 E: [seriously]

77 M: each

78 yes voilà

79 each hand takes at least a half hour

80 and then it is vry easy to spend an hour and a  
half on

81 on one hand

82 so people that I've never seen before

83 well so I see future things I see present things  
and I also see quite a few past things

84 but which are staggering

85 which are staggering

86 I I see things

87 and well!

88 euh Bill introduced me to his family

89 so euh

90 later we got engaged  
91 and then so euh the engagement of course  
92 all all the family had come from everywhere his  
family  
93 and so euh there was a certain Bob  
94 and euh I don't remember how  
95 he is  
96 related  
97 but who is part of the family who is married to a  
woman  
98 but I I I I  
99 I was meeting him for the first time  
100 and so euh  
101 he he he he's a very funny guy euh  
102 who tells jokes  
103 jovial  
104 who likes to eat so  
105 I liked him a lot  
106 outgoing and everything  
107 and we were sitting next to each other  
108 and I don't know how  
109 E: (laughter)  
110 M: it happened

111 E: (laughter)  
112 M: but I noticed  
113 in fact he was speaking  
114 and then I saw a  
115 a thing in his palm that struck me because  
clearly  
116 I don't always look  
117 for example it's a business thing  
118 a business thing  
119 I I don't particularly look for business things in  
palms  
120 C: mmm hmmm  
121 M: I'm presented with a palm and it  
122 E: [ it depends yes ]  
123 M: [it inspires me you know] it speaks  
124 E: yes yes  
125 M: and and  
126 I tell him oh!  
127 there is a trip  
128 to . . . well he was wondering what I was talking  
about  
129 C: (laughter)  
130 M: and then I say he's not going to go  
131 but I I saw it

132 I don't know it struck me  
 133 when I'm presented with a hand  
 134 E: [mmm hmmm]  
 135 M: [ sometimes ] there are things which  
 136 and then there are also hands [which don't  
 inspire]  
 137 E: [which don't say  
 anything ]  
 138 yes  
 139 C: which don't say anything  
 140 M: so euh  
 141 he therefore showed me his hand  
 142 I knew absolutely nothing about him I didn't  
 know at all that he was a business man  
 143 E: mmm  
 144 M: so euh I saw  
 145 I even saw things with his wife  
 146 the the relationship with his wife  
 147 and I even saw the problems  
 148 so so of course people worry when  
 149 [you say that the]  
 150 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 151 M: problem is there  
 152 because it's this burden here that

153 E: [ (laughter) ]  
154 C: [(laughter) (inaudible)]  
155 M: and then euh  
156 I told him but  
157 E: and it's so fascinating  
158 M: I told [ him ]  
159 E: [well the] past [ the future ] revelations  
160 C: [ mmm hmmm ]  
161 M: so I told him  
162 there is  
163 there is a business trip that  
164 that's coming up this week so it's probably the  
weekend we had euh  
165 and and  
166 I  
167 I told him that it was towards Thursday  
168 but that in any event he would not be going  
169 well this made him laugh this made him laugh  
because he had his plane ticket  
170 in business you always have your ticket in  
advance  
171 the hotel reserved  
172 he really laughed to see  
173 that I was telling him

174 no his  
175 so Wednesday eventing all almost smug he  
176 he tells us that no  
177 nothing happened  
178 E: [ he calls yes ]  
179 M: [he's still leaving tomorrow]  
180 E., C.: (laughter)  
181 M: and that at the last it was it's unbelievable  
182 because I mean euh  
183 I don't know why I saw this in his palm  
184 at the last moment he didn't leave  
185 E: (laughter)  
186 M: the company had to cancel  
187 well I no longer remember but the company had  
to cancel  
188 E: they called [I hope]  
189 M: [in fact]  
190 and well he couldn't get over it  
191 he was all  
192 well so it isn't that which surprised him  
193 not only that  
194 but there are there were other things I don't  
know his palm truly inspired me



195 E.,C.: mmm hmmm  
 196 M: and I I told him a bunch of things about his wife  
 197 about her youth about  
 198 E: mmm  
 199 M: he he he couldn't get over it  
 200 so this spread throughout the family  
 201 I had the right to everyone's hands  
 202 E: [(laughter)]  
 203 C: [ ah yes! ]  
 204 M: [yes that is the problem]  
 205 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 206 M: you know as soon as you learn  
 207 and then euh  
 208 just recently  
 209 C: and Bill asked to marry you  
 210 E: [(laughter) you that's it it was an exchange!]  
 211 M: [there there there where but Jean-Marc ]  
 212 but Jean-Marc Jean-Marc  
 213 C: Jean-Marc  
 214 M: but I told him things  
 215 but he thought I was crazy [ he said ]  
 216 E: [yes that's it]

217 M: in fact of course he knew about his life [he's 24  
years old now]

218 E: [(laughter)  
yes that's it ]

219 M: and I told him

220 it was when he was first in the U.S. I saw a  
bunch of things a bunch of things about him he  
says

221 "but she's hallucinating"

222 E: (laughter)

223 M: everything

224 everything that I told Jean-Marc

225 but it's unbelievable!

226 E: so he takes you for euh

227 [for the Messiah now!]

228 M: [ practically ]

229 so in fact he sent me his girlfriends [his women  
his]

230 C.,E.: [ (laughter)  
]

231 E: his harem!

232 M: [he says to me "this one should I trust her? what  
do you think?]

233 E: [ (laughter)  
]

234 M: [no but it's I I was things]  
 235 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 236 M: well listen Elisabeth Caron  
 237 this this is very surprising  
 238 because I generally don't' see insanity in palms  
 239 you know insanity so here I'm talking about  
 lunatics you know  
 240 [about houses]  
 241 E: [ mmm ]  
 242 M: about insane asylums etc.  
 243 so one day in the department it was of course  
 making the rounds  
 244 Annick Fritz's palm  
 245 [Peter's palm]  
 246 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 247 M: the palm  
 248 in short I read several palms  
 249 this day  
 250 so also it's bad to see too many palms at one  
 time right  
 251 E: oh really?  
 252 M: and then euh  
 253 ah yes it's better to have them [far apart]  
 254 E: [ yes yes ]

255 M: and then euh  
 256 so Elisabeth Caron says to me  
 257 "and me  
 258 what do you see"  
 259 so there it's it was bizarre  
 260 because  
 261 I saw her life line  
 262 it was cut  
 263 and then it started again  
 264 and it was however not a death  
 265 [I was certain]  
 266 E: [resurrections] are rare [in fact]  
 267 M: [ I I ]  
 268 I was certain that it wasn't a death  
 269 I ended by examining the crosses because  
 theoretically it is that which guides  
 270 I  
 271 I I examined the other lines I saw the the family  
 relations  
 272 I saw the the the work  
 273 I saw the character the trips etc.  
 274 and then finally I told her  
 275 "listen Elisabeth

276 don't be offended  
 277 don't be upset about what [I'm going to tell you"]  
 278 E: [ but it's nonetheless ]  
 279 quite a revelation [ (laughter)  
 ]  
 280 M: ["about what I'm going to tell  
 you"]  
 281 but I told her the exact age  
 282 but I don't remember anymore euh  
 283 52  
 284 in fact I don't know anymore what age  
 285 I tell her "there is a period of 3 years  
 286 where one would say that you are in a coma"  
 287 I tell her "however there isn't an accident"  
 288 (short break in tape)  
 289 a period of 3 years I tell her the exact age  
 290 you must do that too  
 291 for example Jean-Marc I told him the age he was  
 when he had his first sexual experience and he  
 couldn't get over it  
 292 C.,E.: [ (laughter) ]  
 293 M: [he couldn't get over it (inaudible)]  
 294 B.,C.,E.: [ (laughter)  
 ]

295 M: [well we all now know that he's no longer a  
virgin]

296 E: [yes that's it!] (laughs while speaking)

297 C.,B.: [ (laughter) ]

298 E: she even knows that

299 M: so

300 so therefore there was a gap of 3 years

301 I told her

302 "euh Elisabeth

303 I see a period of coma but there isn't an accident  
this intrigues me"

304 I thoroughly examined this line

305 and I told her

306 "don't be upset

307 but you are going to be in an insane asylum

308 asylum

309 for 3 years

310 and

311 you

312 in any event you will come out of it

313 you you are not lost

314 you will come out of it and you will be just like  
before"

315 and well she was practically flabbergasted

316 because several years ago  
317 she saw  
318 a professional clairvoyant  
319 who exactly  
320 E: who told her [the same thing]  
321 M: [at the same age]  
322 but at the same age you see  
323 I don't know if it's 52 or 47  
324 at the same age  
325 during the same period  
326 maybe half a year earlier  
327 saw in her euh  
328 lunacy  
329 and what's more but this I didn't know in her  
family  
330 there have actually been cases of lunacy  
331 E: mmm  
332 M: so that that is something that flabbergasted her  
333 after euh  
334 E: [ (inaudible) ]  
335 M: [she tells me she tells me] she tells me "the  
children  
336 the children how many children"





358 E: it's not for tutoring

359 M: [I yes so I started to say]

360 B.,C.,E.: [ (laughter) (inaudible) ]

361 M: no but now I refuse if you will because I I say

362 you you understand each time it's a half hour  
for each hand

363 I I don't' have time

364 E: yes

365 M: because if I can't do it in 5 minutes

366 E: mmm hmmm mmm hmmm

367 M: there was one who was leaving for Montpellier

368 a student of Nancy's cam to see me

369 who I had never met before

370 I tell her euh

370 [things]

371 E: [ ah no ] Montpellier no no [ (laughter) ]

372 M: [that concerned]

373 that concerned her family life

374 her relationships with her father and her mother

375 that I wouldn't have

376 well I mean I I would never even have thought of  
it it's not a question of imagination

377 it's a question of seeing lines that inspire

378 E: mmm  
 379 M: or that don't inspire  
 380 and the words come by themselves  
 381 she was completely flabbergasted  
 382 and Nancy never spoke about his student I don't  
 even know wht her name is  
 383 E: so you see that can [be a second a second  
 profession]  
 384 M: [and so as Madame said]  
 385 Madame Barnes I never learned  
 386 to read the lines of a hand  
 387 E: but how did it [come to you? but is there  
 someone in] your family who guided you?  
 388 M: [ I absolutely never learned  
 ]  
 389 no no absolutely not  
 390 what it is is that the  
 391 the people the arab people are  
 392 E: mmm hmmm  
 393 M: are people who are truly superstitious  
 394 and who believe  
 395 euh [ in ]  
 396 E: [mmm]  
 397 M: in the grain of wheat in fact

398           euh there are lots of women  
 399           in the the villages who tell the future in the  
              grains of wheat  
 400   E:     mmm hmmm  
 401   M:     In France it's more the the tarot  
 402   E:     yes [yes]  
 403   M:           [euh]  
 404           and then so in principle there are the  
 405           the gypsies  
 406   E:     yes the [gypsies]  
 407   M:           [ who ] look into memories in fact you  
              must beware especially in France because they make  
              off with your watch  
 408   E:     yes  
 409   M:     while they [read your palms]  
 410   E:               [ (laughter) ]  
 411   M:     it's very well known  
 412           but I never learned  
 413           I never had  
 414           someone who told me euh  
 415           it's this burden that's it  
 416           I don't know if it is by so often very early  
 417           it it [ intrigued me ]  
 418   E:           [it intrigued you]

419 M: I looked at the lines in in people's palms and  
then

420 euh I I talk

421 E: but you didn't read beacuase there are [also  
books]

422 M: [ no no ]

423 E: [ euh quite a few things ]

424 M: [no I've read absolutely nothing I]

425 E: but this didn't prompt you to

426 to read?

427 [things no]

428 M: [no because ] you understand I

429 in in my personal philosophy [I am euh]

430 E: [ mmm ]

431 M: I am extremely anti-determinism

432 E: yes yes

433 M: and myself euh I I laugh

434 at at the things I tell people

## **Appendix 10 "Nîmes"**

"Nîmes", Interactive Representation

Prior to the excerpt reproduced here, Martine has explained that she and a vegetarian friend of hers were in the crowded

streets of Nîmes when they saw a merchant's display of eggs and chicken (with cou tordu) and her friend has expressed to her that he is going to knock the display over because he is disgusted with the idea that someone is profiting from the killing of animals.

- 1 M: et puis on repasse une deuxième fois  
2 et il me dit euh  
3 "tu sais ce que je vais faire euh  
4 je vais  
5 je je vais en passant faire tomber tout l'étalage  
6 les [oeufs les poulets tout ça]  
7 E: [ (laughter) ]  
8 C: [ (inaudible) ]  
9 M: ça va tellement être mélangé  
10 E: [ le gars tu sais ça peut lui ]  
11 M: [oui euh ça va tellement être mélangé]  
12 non mais il était malade  
13 un peu  
14 mental  
15 hein il a eu des suites  
16 E: ah tes amis  
17 ils sont  
18 M: oui mais mes amis je les choisis (inaudible)  
(laughter while speaking)

19 E: [d'accords]  
 20 M: [alors euh]  
 21 on passe effectivement  
 22 il me dit  
 23 "tu prends la chienne  
 24 et euh je partirai  
 25 on se donne rendez-vous  
 26 à la troisième rue enfin  
 27 à telle rue  
 28 alors je me suis dit il va jamais le faire  
 29 c'était samedi après-midi  
 30 la foule de Nîmes  
 31 la population entière était dans cette rue [ce jour  
 cette rue]  
 32 C: [ (laughter) ]  
 33 M: cette rue piétonne  
 34 B: ça c'est l'exageration du m  
 35 du Midi tu vois  
 36 C., E.: (laughter)  
 37 E: on s'en était aperçu!  
 38 M: et alors on passe  
 39 je dis "il va pas le faire"  
 40 et vas-y

41 il y va  
 42 il renverse tout  
 43 et il file  
 44 la foule n'est-ce pas s'agglutine [ autour de ]  
 45 E: [elle exagère]  
 46 M: de de ces animaux par terre  
 47 le type sort  
 48 ce . . . euh  
 49 regarde bêtement ses animaux  
 50 la foule plus de gens arrivent n'est-ce pas et qui  
 disent mais qu'est-ce qui se passe et le type qui  
 dit "je les ai vus!  
 51 ils étaient toute une bande!  
 52 ils se sont sauvés!"  
  
 53 C: (loud laughter) [oh mais y en avait un y en avait  
 un!]  
 54 All: [ (laughter)  
 ]  
 55 E: oui  
 56 ?: (inaudible)  
 57 E: il aurait pu penser qui pour lui c'était son  
 gagne-pain euh  
 58 [si]

59 C: [ben] oui  
 60 E: (inaudible)  
 61 M: oui mais tu sais que  
 62 ces ces gens  
 63 qui ont des problèmes existentiels  
 64 C: [ (inaudible) ]  
 65 E: [oui mais (inaudible)]  
 66 M: [ (inaudible) ]  
 67 C: tu aurais pu l'arrêter!  
 68 E: moi je l'aurais dit "écoutes [t'as]  
 69 M: [moi] je trouvais ça  
 marrant  
 70 [ça m'était jamais arrivé]  
 71 C: [ ça m'étonne pas ça ] m'étonne pas!  
 72 M: ça m'était jamais arrivé  
 73 (laughter)  
 74 E: (pause) (voiced sigh)  
 75 M: on s'est retrouvé  
 76 deux rues plus loin  
 77 et je lui dit  
 78 "ils ont dit  
 79 ils étaient toute une bande je les ai vus ils se  
 sont sauvés



80           il riait il n'en pouvait plus  
81   E:    (soft laughter)  
82   C:    c'est quand même bête ça  
83   E:    Betsy est-ce que tu nous fais une  
84           une vinaigrette  
85           est-ce que tu utilises la vinaigrette?

"Nîmes", Interactive Representation, translation

1     M:    and then we go by a second time  
2           and he says to me euh  
3           "do you know what I'm going to do euh  
4           I'm going to  
5           I I'm going to while going by knock over the  
          whole display  
6           the [eggs the chickens everything]  
7   E:       [           (laughter)           ]  
8   C:       [           (inaudible)           ]  
9   M:    it's going to be really mixed up  
10   E:    [       the guy you know he could       ]  
11   M:    [yes euh it's going to be really mixed up]  
12           no but he was sick  
13           a little  
14           mental

15           uh he had some episodes  
16     E:     ah your friends  
17           they are  
18     M:     yes but I choose my friends (inaudible) (laughter  
while speaking)  
19     E:     [ yes ]  
20     M:     [so euh]  
21           we actually go by  
22           he tells me  
23           "you take the dog  
24           and euh I will go  
25           we set a rendez-vous  
26           at 3<sup>rd</sup> Street or  
27           at such and such Road  
28           so I said to myself he's never going to do it  
29           it was Saturday afternoon  
30           the crowd of Nîmes  
31           the entire population was on this road [that day  
this road]  
32     C:                                 [[laughter]]  
33     M:     this pedestrian road  
34     B:     that that is the exaggeration of the m  
35           of the Midi you see

36 C., E.: (laughter)  
 37 E: we noticed that!  
 38 M: and so we went by  
 39 I say "he's not going to do it"  
 40 and he goes there  
 41 he goes there  
 42 he turns everything over  
 43 and he flees  
 44 the crowd then gathers [ around ]  
 45 E: [she's exaggerating]  
 46 M: the the these animals on the ground  
 47 the guy leaves  
 48 this. . . euh  
 49 looks wide-eyed at his animals  
 50 a bigger crowd of people arrive of course and  
 who are saying but what's happening and the  
 guy says "I saw them!  
 51 there was a whole group!  
 52 they escaped!"  
 53 C: (loud laughter) [oh but there was only one, there  
 was only one!]  
 54 All: [ (laughter)  
 ]  
 55 E: yes



77           and I say to him  
78           "they said  
79           there was a whole group I saw them and they  
              escaped  
80           he laughed he couldn't get over it  
81    E:     (soft laughter)  
82    C:     that is nevertheless dumb  
83    E:     Betsy did you make us this  
84           vinaigrette  
85           do you use a vinaigrette?

"Nîmes", Polanyian Representation

1           et puis on repasse une deuxième fois  
2           et il me dit  
3           euh  
4           "tu sais  
5           ce que je vais faire  
6           euh  
7           je vais  
8           je  
9           je vais en passant faire tomber tout l'étalage  
10          les oeufs les poulets tout ça  
**11**         (laughter)

**12** (inaudible)  
13 ça va tellement être mélangé  
**14** le gars tu sais  
**15** ça peut lui  
16 oui euh  
17 ça va tellement être mélangé  
18 non  
19 mais  
20 il était malade un peu mental  
21 hein  
22 il a eu des suites  
**23** ah tes amis ils sont  
24 oui  
25 mais  
26 mes amis je les choisis (inaudible)  
24-26 (laughter while speaking)  
**27** d'accords  
28 alors euh  
29 on passe effectivement  
30 il me dit  
31 "tu prends la chienne et  
32 euh

33 je partirai"  
34 on se donne rendez-vous à la troisième rue  
35 enfin à telle rue  
36 alors  
37 je me suis dit  
38 il va jamais le faire  
39 c'était samedi après-midi  
40 la foule de Nîmes  
41 la population entière était dans cette rue ce jour  
42 cette rue  
**43** (laughter)  
44 cette rue piétonne  
**45** ça c'est l'exageration du m  
**46** du Midi  
**47** tu vois  
**48** (laughter)  
**49** on s'en était aperçu!  
50 et alors  
51 on passe  
52 je dis  
53 "il vas pas le faire"  
54 et vas-y

55 il y va  
56 il renverse tout  
57 et il file  
58 la foule  
59 n'est-ce pas  
60 s'agglutine autour de  
**61** elle exagère  
62 de  
63 de ces animaux par terre  
64 le type sort  
65 ce  
66 euh  
67 regarde bêtement ses animaux  
68 la foule plus de gens arrivent  
69 n'est-ce pas  
70 et qui disent  
71 "mais qu'est-ce qui se passe"  
72 et le type qui dit  
73 "je les ai vus!  
74 ils étaient toute une bande!  
75 ils se sont sauvés!"  
**76** (loud laughter)



**77** oh mais y en avait un  
**78** y en avait un!  
**79/79** (laughter)  
**80** oui  
81 (inaudible)  
**82** il aurait pu penser  
**83** qui pour lui c'était son gangne-pain  
**84** euh  
**85** si  
**86** ben oui  
**87** (inaudible)  
88 oui mais tu sais  
89 que ces  
90 ces gens qui ont des problèmes existentiels  
**91** (inaudible)  
**92** oui mais (inaudible)  
93 (inaudible)  
**94** tu aurais pu l'arrêter!  
**95** moi je l'aurais dit  
**96** "écoutes  
**97** t'as"  
98 moi je trouvais ça marrant

99           ça m'était jamais arrivé  
**100**          ça m'étonne pas  
**101**          ça m'étonne pas!  
 102          ça m'était jamais arrivé  
 103          (laughter)  
**104**          (pause, then voiced sigh)  
 105          on s'est retrouvé deux rues plus loin  
 106          et je lui dit  
 107          "ils ont dit  
 108          ils étaient toute une bande  
 109          je les ai vus  
 110          ils se sont sauvés  
 111          il riait  
 112          il n'en pouvait plus  
**113**          (soft laughter)  
**114**          c'est quand même bête ça  
**115**          Betsy est-ce que tu nous fais une  
**116**          une vinaigrette  
**117**          est-ce que tu utilises la vinaigrette?

"Nîmes", Non-Storyworld Clauses

3            euh

6 euh

**11** (laughter)

**14** le gars tu sais

**15** ça peut lui

16 oui euh

18 non

19 mais

20 il était malade un peu mental

21 hein

22 il a eu des suites

**23** ah tes amis ils sont

24 oui

25 mais

26 mes amis je les choisis (inaudible)

24-26 (laughter while speaking)

**27** d'accords

28 alors euh

32 euh

36 alors

**43** (laughter)

**45** ça c'est l'exageration du m

**46** du Midi

**47** tu vois  
**48** (laughter)  
**49** on s'en était aperçu!  
50 et alors  
59 n'est-ce pas  
**61** elle exagère  
66 euh  
69 n'est-ce pas  
**76** (loud laughter)  
**77** oh mais y en avait un  
**78** y en avait un!  
79/**79** (laughter)  
**80** oui  
**82** il aurait pu penser  
**83** qui pour lui c'était son gagne-pain  
**84** euh  
**85** si  
**86** ben oui  
88 oui mais tu sais  
89 que ces  
90 ces gens qui ont des problèmes existentiels  
**92** oui mais (inaudible)

<b>94</b>	tu aurais pu l'arrêter!
<b>95</b>	moi je l'aurais dit
<b>96</b>	"écoutes
<b>97</b>	t'as"
98	moi je trouvais ça marrant
99	ça m'était j'aimais arrivé
<b>100</b>	ça m'étonne pas
<b>101</b>	ça m'étonne pas!
102	ça m'était jamais arrivé
103	(laughter)
<b>104</b>	(pause, then voiced sigh)
<b>113</b>	(soft laughter)
<b>114</b>	c'est quand même bête ça
<b>115</b>	Betsy est-ce que tu nous fais une
<b>116</b>	une vinaigrette
<b>117</b>	est-ce que tu utilises la vinaigrette?

#### Breakdown of Non-Storyworld Clauses in "Nîmes"

Neutral Non-Storyworld clauses uttered by Martine

3	euh
6	euh
28	alors euh

32	euh
36	alors
50	et alors
66	euh

Neutral Non-Storyworld clauses uttered by Recipients

84	E:	euh
----	----	-----

External Exclamations uttered by Martine

21	hein
24-26	(laughter while speaking
79	All: (laughter)
103	(laughter)

External Exclamations uttered by Recipients

11	E:	(laughter)
43	C:	(laughter)
48	C.,E.:	(laughter)
49	E:	on e'en était aperçu!
76	C:	(loud laughter)
77	C:	oh mais y en avait un
78	C:	y en avait un!
79	All:	(laughter)
100	C:	ça m'étonne pas
101	C:	ça m'étonne pas!

External Comments uttered by Martine

- |     |  |                            |
|-----|--|----------------------------|
| 16  |  | oui euh                    |
| 59  |  | n'est-ce pas               |
| 69  |  | n'est-ce pas               |
| 98  |  | moi je trouvais ça marrant |
| 99  |  | ça m'était jamais arrivé   |
| 102 |  | ça m'était jamais arrivé   |

External Comments uttered by Recipients

- |     |    |                                     |
|-----|----|-------------------------------------|
| 14  | E: | le gars tu sais                     |
| 15  | E: | ça peut lui                         |
| 23  | E: | ah tes amis ils sont                |
| 27  | E: | d'accords                           |
| 45  | B: | ça c'est l'exageration du m         |
| 46  | B: | du Midi                             |
| 47  | B: | tu vois                             |
| 61  | E: | elle exagère                        |
| 80  | E: | oui                                 |
| 82  | E: | il aurait pu penser                 |
| 83  | E: | qui pour lui c'était son gagne-pain |
| 85  | E: | si                                  |
| 86  | C: | ben oui                             |
| 104 | E: | (voiced sigh)                       |

- 113 E: (soft laughter)  
114 C: c'est quand même bête ça  
115 E: Betsy est-ce que tu nous fais une  
116 E: une vinaigrette  
117 E: est-ce que tu utilises la vinaigrette?

External Disagreement uttered by Martine

- 18 non  
19 mais  
20 il était malade un peu mental  
22 il a eu des suites  
24 oui  
25 mais  
26 mes amis je les choisis  
88 oui mais tu sais  
89 que ces  
90 ces gens qui ont des problèmes existentiels

External Disagreement uttered by Recipients

- 92 E: oui mais  
94 C: tu aurais pu l'arrêter!  
95 E: moi je l'aurais dit  
96 E: "écoutes  
97 E: t'as"



## Appendix 11 "couscous"

"couscous", Interactive Representation

- 1 M: euh  
2 dans les exercices  
3 à un moment on dit euh  
4 deux américains enfin voyagent  
5 en Algérie  
6 et puis ils se sont arrêtés dans un bon  
restaurant où ils ont mangé un couscous
- 7 C., E.: mmm hmm
- 8 M: alors évidemment tout le monde m'a dit qu'est-  
ce que c'est un couscous
- 9 C: alors pas de [problèmes!]
- 10 E: [(laughter) ]
- 11 M: évidemment experte en la matière
- 12 E: [il faudrait que tu me dises parce que moi je sais  
pas]
- 13 M: [ je leur ai tout dit  
]
- 14 et ben c'est le grain de blé le wheat [ hein  
]
- 15 E: [oui je sais  
mais]

16 je connais pas vraiment  
17 tout ce qui y a  
18 M: le principe  
19 E: oui c'est [ça]  
20 M: [bon]  
21 alors j'explique avec le le principe de gonflage  
22 et puis  
23 euh  
24 enfin voilà  
25 et puis deux semaines plus tard donc ça fait à  
peu près  
26 y a trois jours  
27 une de mes étudiantes qui vient  
28 et puis elle me dit euh  
29 euh  
30 "vous savez  
31 euh  
32 Martine euh  
33 j'ai parlé à la maison de ce couscous  
34 et puis alors Maman aimerait qu'on en fasse  
35 pouvez-vous me donner la recette?"  
36 je dis mais  
37 "quel insulte!"

38 le le couscous c'est le genre de plat justement  
 que même si on a la recette  
 39 ça ne marchera pas  
 40 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 41 M: [il faut l'avoir vu] fait  
 42 E: la pauvre étudiante  
 43 M: non non mais c'est ça  
 44 c'est ça  
 45 y a des  
 46 y a des étapes  
 47 E: [oui oui]  
 48 M: [qui se ] font avec [ la main même ]  
 49 C: [(inaudible) chez MacDo]  
 50 E: [ (inaudible) ]  
 51 M: et si tu le fais  
 52 si tu le fait dix minutes de trop  
 53 il va être raté  
 54 il va être mastoc  
 55 tu vois  
 56 E: mm hmm  
 57 M: alors je lui ai dit  
 58 je veux bien vous expliquer  
 59 mais il faut le voir faire

60 C: oui

61 M: au moins une fois pour comprendre le principe  
du couscous ou c'est pas la peine

62 E: mm hmm

63 M: alors euh

64 surtout si c'est la première fois

65 E: oui

66 M: alors euh

67 je lui ai dit

68 euh

69 E: (laughter)

70 M: si vraiment ça intéresse votre famille je veux  
bien venir

71 E: mm hmm

72 M: le faire

73 E: mm

74 M: et puis alors vous pouvez me regarder

75 enfin tu pourras me regarder

76 et puis comme ça [tu sauras le faire pour la  
prochaine fois]

77 E: [vous pouvez prendre des  
photos!]

78 je ne vous inter[dis pas de prendre quelques  
photos]

79 M: [ non non non non tu vois  
]
80 C: [je signerai les autographes éventuellement]
81 E: [ (laughter) ]
82 M: [ non non je lui ai dit ]
83 [j'ai dit à la limite]
84 E: [ (laughter) ]
85 M: je préfère venir passer une après-midi
86 parce que
87 quand je lui ai dit que ça prenait toute une  
après-[midi]
88 E: [oui ]
89 elle a commen[cé à (inaudible) ]
90 M: [(inaudible) elle a pensé] que c'était  
le plat
91 n'est-ce pas
92 qu'on [faisait en demi-heure (inaudible)]
93 E: [oui non mais elle pensait qu'on ]  
l'achetait comme tous les
94 les choses
95 tu ajoutes un peu d'eau
96 M: voilà!
97 C: voilà!
98 E: et puis [ça se fait]

99 M: [alors euh]  
100 non  
101 quand je lui ai dit que ça prenait tout l'après-  
midi déjà  
102 euh ça l'a un peu  
103 surprise  
104 alors je lui ai dit  
105 parce que  
106 vraiment  
107 enfin moi ça me dérangerait pas  
108 euh et puis  
109 et puis je préfère le montrer comment on le fait  
110 et puis  
111 comme ça la prochaine fois tu pourras le faire  
pour ta famille  
112 alors elle me dit "bon je vais en parler à la  
maison"  
113 E: mm hmm  
114 M: euh  
115 alors euh  
116 elle revient à la fin du mid-term écrit donc hier  
117 elle avait fini un peu avant les autres  
118 et puis elle me dit  
119 "vous savez

120 j'en ai parlé à la maison  
121 et vraiment la famille est intéressée euh  
122 E: mm hmm  
123 M: tout le monde a l'air excité  
124 excité  
125 euh mais  
126 mais Papa  
127 euh  
128 Papa est très impressionné par l'idée d'un  
professeur  
129 de français qui va venir à la maison  
130 E: (laughter)  
131 M: alors  
132 alors je lui ai dit  
133 je lui ai dit "mais enfin Swan il faut dit à votre  
Papa  
134 que je suis professeur de 8 à 9 chaque jour  
135 E.,C.: (laughter)  
136 C: et le reste  
137 E: [ (laughter) ]  
138 M: [après 9 heures]  
139 y a plus de professeur y a Martine Karsten  
140 une une une une dame de 23 ans très simple

"couscous", translation

- 1 M: euh  
2 in the exercises  
3 there is a point where it says euh  
4 well two Americans are taking a trip  
5 to Algeria  
6 and then they stopped at a good restaurant  
where they ate couscous
- 7 C., E.: mmm hmm
- 8 M: so of course everyone asked me what couscous  
is
- 9 C: well no [problem!]
- 10 E: [(laughter)]
- 11 M: clearly an expert on the subject
- 12 E: [you must tell me because I don't know]
- 13 M: [ I told them everything ]
- 14 and so there is the grain of wheat the wheat  
[huh]
- 15 E: [yes I know  
but]
- 16 I don't really know
- 17 all that there is
- 18 M: the principle



19 E: yes that's [it]  
20 M: [so]  
21 well I explain about the ideas of swelling  
22 and then  
23 euh  
24 there you go  
25 and then two weeks later which was about  
26 three days ago  
27 one of my students who came  
28 and then she says to me euh  
29 euh  
30 "you know  
31 euh  
32 Martine euh  
33 I spoke about this couscous at home  
34 and well then my Mom would like us to make it  
35 can you give me the recipe?"  
36 I say but  
37 "what an insult!"  
38 couscous is the type of dish that even if you  
have the recipe  
39 it simply won't work  
40 E: [ (laughter) ]

41 M: [you must see it] made  
42 E: the poor student  
43 M: no no but that's it  
44 that's it  
45 there are  
46 there are steps  
47 E: [yes yes]  
48 M: [which are] done by [ hand ]  
49 C: [(inaudible) chez MacDo]  
50 E: [ (inaudible) ]  
51 M: and if you cook it  
52 if you cook it ten minutes too long  
53 it will be ruined  
54 it will be lumpy  
55 you see  
56 E: mm hmm  
57 M: so I told her  
58 I would like to explain it to you  
59 but you must see it done  
60 C: yes  
61 M: at least on time to understand the idea of  
couscous or it's not worth it  
62 E: mm hmm

63 M: so euh  
 64 especially if it's the first time  
 65 E: yes  
 66 M: so euh  
 67 I told her  
 68 euh  
 69 E: (laughter)  
 70 M: if your family is really interested I would like to  
 come  
 71 E: mm hmm  
 72 M: and do it  
 73 E: mm  
 74 M: and so then you can watch me  
 75 so you will be able to watch me  
 76 the then this way [you will know how to do it for  
 the next time]  
 77 E: [ you can take some  
 pictures!]  
 78 I will not stop you[from taking a few pictures]  
 79 M: [ no no no no you see ]  
 80 C: [I will be so kind as to sign autographs]  
 81 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 82 M: [ no no I told her ]  
 83 [I said at the very least]

84 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 85 M: I prefer to come spend an afternoon  
 86 because  
 87 when I told her that it takes an entire after[noon]  
 88 E: [ yes ]  
 89 she be[gan to (inaudible) ]  
 90 M: [ (inaudible) she thought ] that it was a  
 dish  
 91 right  
 92 that was [made in half an hour (inaudible)]  
 93 E: [ yes no but she thought that it ]  
 could be bought like every  
 94 thing  
 95 you add a little water  
 96 M: voilà!  
 97 C: voilà!  
 98 E: and then [it's done]  
 99 M: [ so euh ]  
 100 no  
 101 when I told her that it takes an entire afternoon  
 already  
 102 euh that surprised her  
 103 a little  
 104 so I told her

105           because  
106           truly  
107           well it would not bother me  
108           euh and then  
109           and then I prefer to show how to do it  
110           and then  
111           that way the next time you will be able to make  
              it for your family  
112           so she says to me "well I will talk aobut this at  
              home"  
113   E:     mm hmm  
114   M:     euh  
115           so euh  
116           she comes back after the written mid-term thus  
              yesterday  
117           she had finished a little before the others  
118           and then she says to me  
119           "you know  
120           I spoke about it at home  
121           and truly my family is interested euh  
122   E:     mm hmm  
123   M:     everyone seems to be excited  
124           excited  
125           euh but

126 but Papa  
 127 euh  
 128 Papa is quite struck by the idea of a French  
 129 professor who is going to come to the house  
 130 E: (laughter)  
 131 M: so  
 132 so I said to her  
 133 I said to her "but well Swan you must tell your  
 Papa  
 134 that I am only a professor from 8 to 9 each day  
 135 E.,C.: (laughter)  
 136 C: and otherwise  
 137 E: [ (laughter) ]  
 138 M: [after 9 o'clock]  
 139 there is no longer a professor there is Martine  
 Karsten  
 140 a a a a very simple woman of 23

## **Appendix 12 "rouge et vert"**

"rouge et vert", Interactive Representation

1 M: et puis  
 2 et puis alors  
 3 le le le grand patron de de mon mari

4            la semaine de Noël  
 5            il porte son costume de Noël  
 6    M,C,E: rouge et vert!  
 7    C:    [quelle horreur!]  
 8    B,E: [(laughter)]  
 9    M:    oui oui  
 10           c'est c'est incroyable  
 11           on a été à des des parties  
 12    ?:    (inaudible)  
 13    M:    de de de Noël et  
 14           euh  
 15           il était fier  
 16    C:    [oh c'est marrant ça]  
 17    M:    [de son costume]  
 18           il le sort chaque année!  
 19    All:    (laughter)  
 20    M:    mais c'est sa femme qui a dû l'choisir!  
 21    All:    (laughter)  
 22    C:    oh c'est marrant hein

"rouge et vert", translation

1    M:    and then

2           and then so  
3           my my my husband's boss  
4           the week of Christmas  
5           he wears his Christmas suit  
6    M,C,E: red and green!  
7    C:    [how awful!]  
8    B,E:  [(laughter)]  
9    M:    yes yes  
10          it's it's unbelievable  
11          we were at some some parties  
12    ?:    (inaudible)  
13    M:    for for for Christmas and  
14          euh  
15          he was proud  
16    C:    [oh that's funny]  
17    M:    [    of his suit    ]  
18          he gets it out every year!  
19    All:  (laughter)  
20    M:    but it must be his wife who chose it!  
21    All:  (laughter)  
22    C:    oh that's funny isn't it



## Bibliography

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barnes, Betsy. 1984. *Minnesota Corpus*. University of Minnesota.
- Barthes, Roland. 1966. "Introduction à l'analyse structurale des récits." *Communications* 8:1-27.
- Bauman, Richard. 1986. *Story, Performance, and Event: Contextual studies of oral narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blyth, Carl. 1990. *Evaluation in oral Québécois narratives: The function of non-referential meaning in discourse*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Cornell University.
- Blyth, Carl. 2002. "Between orality and literacy: Developing a pedagogical norm for narrative discourse." In Susan Gass, Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig, Sally Sieloff Magnan and Joel Walz (eds.) *Pedagogical Norms for Second and Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bonikowski, Heather Guerrero. 1999. "Agreement and Disagreement about Stereotypes: Constructing Group Identity" *Papers from the Regional Meetings*, Chicago Linguistic Society, 35, 2:13-27
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Cook, Guy. 2000. *Language Play, Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Culler, Jonathan. 1981. *The Pursuit of Signs*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, Alessandro and Charles Goodwin (eds.). 1992. *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferrara, Kathleen Warden. 1994. *Therapeutic Ways with Words*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1990. *Tense and Narrativity: From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin, Charles and Marjorie Harness Goodwin. 1992. "Assessments and the construction of context." In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Havel, Vaclev. 1989. *Letters of Olga*. Trans. Paul Wilson. New York: Henry Holt.
- Heath, Shirley Brice. 1983. *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, Janet. 1997. "Struggling Beyond Labov and Waletzky", *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1-4): 91-96.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1993. *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Johnstone, Barbara. 1990. *Stories, Community and Place: Narratives from Middle America*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 1996. *The Linguistic Individual: Self-Expression in Language and Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Küntay, Aylin and Susan Ervin-Tripp. 1997. "Narrative Structure and Conversational Circumstances", *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1-4): 113-120.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William. 1997. "Some further steps in narrative analysis." *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7:395-415.
- Labov, William. 2001. "Uncovering the event structure of narrative." To appear in *Georgetown University Round Table 2001*. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Labov, William. 2002. "Ordinary events." A contribution to the proceedings of a conference at Pitzer College. <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~wlabov/home.html>.
- Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky. 1967. "Narrative Analysis: Oral Version of Personal Experience." In J. Helm (ed.) *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Leitch, Thomas. 1986. *What Stories Are: Narrative Theory and Interpretation*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Linde, Charlotte. 1993. *The Creation of Coherence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, Wallace. 1986. *Recent Theories of Narrative*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Miller, P., Potts, R., Fung, H., Hoogstra, L., and Mintz, J. 1990. "Narrative Practices and the Social Construction of Self in Childhood", *American Ethnologist*, 17:292-311.
- Milroy, Lesley. 1987. *Observing and Analysing Natural Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1979. "Transcription as theory." In E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin, (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp.43-72). New York: Academic Press.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1986. "From feelings to grammar." In B.B. Schieffelin, E. Ochs (eds.) *Language Socialization Across Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1997. "Narrative." In T.A. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Structure and Process*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ochs Elinor and Lisa Capps. 1996. "Narrating the Self", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 25:19-43.
- Ochs, Elinor and Lisa Capps. 2001. *Living Narrative: Creating Lives in Everyday Storytelling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ochs, Elinor, Smith, Ruth, and Carolyn Taylor. 1989. "Detective Stories at Dinnertime: Problem-Solving through Co-narration", *Cultural Dynamics*, 2: 238-257.
- Ong, Walter J. 1982. "Oral Remembering and Narrative Structures." In Deborah Tannen (ed.) *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Polanyi, Livia. 1985. *Telling the American Story: A Structural and Cultural Analysis of Conversational Storytelling*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. "Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes." In J. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of*

- Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: University Press, 57-101.
- Prince, Gerald. 1973. *A Grammar of Stories*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Prince, Gerald. 1982. *Narratology: The form and functioning of narrative*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Prince, Gerald. 1991. "Narratology, narrative and meaning." *Poetics Today*, 12: 543-552.
- Propp, Vladimir. 1958. *Morphology of the Folktale*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation. Volume II*. ed. Gail Jefferson. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1966. *A course in general linguistics*, ed. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye; trans. Wade Baskin. New York: McGraw Hill. (Original work published 1916.)
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1997. "'Narrative Analysis' Thirty Years Later", *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1-4): 97-106.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, Jeannie Banks. 1992. *Transgressing Language: Laughter and the Narratives of Women*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Toolan, Michael J. 1988. *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London: Routledge.

## **Vita**

Susan Elizabeth Carbon was born on April 26, 1972 in Indianapolis, IN. Ms. Carbon's parents are Margaret Ann Kunkel and Lawrence Edward Mattler and her husband is John Michael Lawrence Carbon. Ms. Carbon received her B.A. degree with distinction in French and History from Indiana University in 1994, and her M.A. in French Language from the University of Texas in 1997. Ms. Carbon was awarded membership in Phi Beta Kappa in 1994. In 1997 Ms. Carbon was elected Co-President of the French and Italian Graduate Student Organization and in 1998 she received the Wheatley-Swanson award for outstanding service to the French and Italian department at the University of Texas. Also at the University of Texas, Ms. Carbon was a Teaching Assistant from 1995 to 1997 and an Assistant Instructor from 1997 to 1999 and was named Outstanding Instructor for the 1998-1999 academic year. Ms. Carbon was a grant recipient for The Hewlett Project to develop innovative teaching materials in 1999. While writing her dissertation and living variously in St. Louis, MO, Minneapolis, MN, and Hartford, CT from 1999 to 2003, Ms. Carbon was employed as a Substitute Teacher in the Clayton, MO school district, an Instructor for the Government Career Center in St.

Louis, MO, a Career Database Administrator at the Weston Career Resource Center at Washington University in St. Louis, MO, a Bookseller at Barnes and Noble in Minneapolis, MN, a Cheese Seller at Say Cheese Too! In West Hartford, CT, and as a Private Instructor of French in the Greater Hartford, CT area.

Permanent address:     9 Pelham Road  
                                 West Hartford, CT  
                                 06107

This dissertation was typed by the author.